

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_77510
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of clay from Isan Ekiti Deposits for making the Ceramic Water Purifier
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to lack of clarity, manuscript should be fully revised. • Page 1, under heading "Introduction", paragraph 1, the first line should begin as "Since 2020" in place of "As at the year 2020". • Page 1, under heading "Introduction", paragraph 1, line no. 4, the word "governments" should be replaced by "government". • Page 2, under heading "Introduction", paragraph 1, line no. 18, the word "unprotected" should be replaced by "unprotected". • Page 2, under heading "Introduction", paragraph 2 needs clarity. • Page 2, under heading "Introduction", paragraph 3, the sentence "One of the communities that may be exposed to the risk of contaminated water while it has potential capability of CWP filter production is Isan Ekiti and its environs", can be replaced by "One of the communities of Isan Ekiti that may be exposed to the risk of contaminated water has potential capability of CWP filter production". • Page 3, under heading "Sample collection", the first paragraph should begin as "Clay samples were collected from <i>orudi</i>, <i>arade</i> and <i>oturo</i> deposits for examination as these locations have major clay deposits. The samples were dried in an electric furnace at 110°C for 12 hours, then materials were pulverized and sieved through a 590-micron sieve manually. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Table 1, % Burn Out (Saw Dust). It is saw dust ash or saw dust. Clarify the difference between burn out and saw dust. • Page 5, what is the acceptable range of shrinkage, should be mentioned and compared to results obtained. • The way of writing reference in text varies from page to page in the manuscript. As on page 3, it has been written as [7] and on page 4 "Rosa, (2017)". Journal guidelines should be followed. • Page 4, section 2.6, the test pieces were fired at 880⁰C. Why the test pieces were fired at this temperature only, justification should be mentioned. <p>Results and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 7, under heading "3.1 Particle size analysis", authors should also write whether particles are well graded or poorly graded and justification; and the influences of particle size on the test pieces. • Page 11, under heading "3.8 Efficiency in reducing microbial load", the reasons for reduction in microbial load should be explained. What are the norms for the total coliform and up to what percentage, these are removed? The purpose for which the filtrate has to be used, to be explained. • Figures should be properly drawn. Captions for Figures and Tables are required to be checked. • Supporting references are required to be incorporated in section 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6. <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be revised. 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authors have made an attempt to prepare Ceramic Water Purifier (CWP) using saw dust and clay of orudi, arade and oturo locations in different proportions. They have tried to assess the rate of filtration, turbidity and microbial load efficiency of filtrate.• Approach is good. <p>• I understand that the full manuscript is required to be edited to improve the clarity and make it understandable.</p>	
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surendra Roy
Department, University & Country	Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Technical University, India