



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17754
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE LEACHABILITY OF HEAVY METALS FROM SEWAGE SLUDGE, SAWDUST AND ORGANIC FRACTION OF SOLID WASTE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 10: organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) Line 41: Longe et al., 2009 Line 47: Schnoor, 1996 Line 69: Aluko et al., 2003 Line 96: in Line 105: O'Leary & Walsh, 1995 Line 147: what is the oven temp Line 183: Poznyak et al., year Line 324: leachates	The reviewer's comments have been noted and the manuscript was amended accordingly. I have simply mentioned the affected line numbers to enable you verify that the corrections were made. Please note that line numbers have changed due to the amendment See Line 16 See Line 54 See Line 60 See Line 82 See Line 109 See Line 118 See Line 164 (oven temperature is 105° C) See Line 200 (Year is 2008) See Line 358
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I seem not to get the objective(s) of the work	The objective of the research has been stated. See Lines 120 - 122