

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Address:

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering-WULS

SGGW w Warszawie

ul. Nowoursynowska 159

02-776 WARSAW

POLAND

tel.(022) 59 35 248, 240, 225, 210

e-mail: iks_pn@sggw.pl

Warsaw, 28-03-2017

I would kindly ask to review the following manuscript submitted to "Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences" using following questionnaire/form.

Office Secretary
(Katarzyna Pawluk)

No., title of manuscript: *The Model Relationship of Wastes for Parameter Design with Green Lean Production of Fresh Water*

1. The paper:

- a) represents scientific level (the tests results and conclusions are presented; there are the "methodology" and "results" sections)
- b) represents popular science level (contains new ideas)
- c) does not represent scientific level and/or does not contain new ideas

If you choose the "c" please do not fill in the rest of the form.

2. The research methods:

- a) are correct and properly described
- b) should be supplemented and/or described in more detail
- c) are incorrect

3. The analysis and synthesis of results:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) are incorrect

4. The statistical approaches:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) have incorrect assumption
- d) are needless

5. Tables and figures:

- a) are correct; have descriptions
- b) are correct; do not have descriptions
- c) should be supplemented
- d) are inappropriate

6. The abstract and key words:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)

7. Title of the manuscript is correct and corresponding to the text yes no

8. The conclusions:

- a) are correct and resulted from research presented in the paper
- b) should be supplemented

c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)

9. The references included recent publications (especially from the last two years) and are:

a) sufficient

b) insufficient

10. Manuscript language:

a) is correct

b) should be edited

c) is incorrect

12. Overall assessment

a) **very good – submit without any amendments**

b) **good - submit with an amendments**

c) **submit corrected paper without second review**

d) **submit corrected paper after second review**

e) **poor – unable to publish**

11. To the best of my knowledge, the paper had been already published in the same or similar form yes no

The place for comments – especially for issues which should be supplemented and/or corrected

The paper covers very interesting topic of modeling Wastes for Parameter Design with Green Lean Production of Fresh Water.

In the paper some information about perspectives of the presented topic should be presented.

State of the literature should cover more publications connected with the topic of the publication, as for example presented in the publication of: ANALIZA SKUTECZNOŚCI DZIAŁANIA OCZYSZCZALNI ŚCIEKÓW „KUJAWY”

Krzysztof CHMIEŁOWSKI, Bernadeta RAJCHEL, Magdalena KARNAS

DOI: 10.7862/rb.2016.107 in the JCEEA

The reviewer' name only for Editorial Office knowledge. The names of the reviewers assisting the editorial board will be listed in the last issue of each year and in the web.

Date 27042017

Reviewer signature

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Address:

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering-WULS

SGGW w Warszawie

ul. Nowoursynowska 159

02-776 WARSAW

POLAND

tel.(022) 59 35 248, 240, 225, 210

e-mail: iks_pn@sggw.pl

20-04-2017

I would kindly ask to review the following manuscript submitted to "Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences" using following questionnaire/form.

Office Secretary
(Katarzyna Pawluk)

No., title of manuscript: *The Model Relationship of Wastes for Parameter Design with Green Lean Production of Fresh Water*

1. The paper:

- a) represents scientific level (the tests results and conclusions are presented; there are the "methodology" and "results" sections)
- b) represents popular science level (contains new ideas)
- c) does not represent scientific level and/or does not contain new ideas

If you choose the "c" please do not fill in the rest of the form.

2. The research methods:

- a) are correct and properly described
- b) should be supplemented and/or described in more detail
- c) are incorrect

3. The analysis and synthesis of results:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) are incorrect

4. The statistical approaches:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) have incorrect assumption
- d) are needless

5. Tables and figures:

- a) are correct; have descriptions
- b) are correct; do not have descriptions
- c) should be supplemented
- d) are inappropriate

6. The abstract and key words:

- a) are correct
- b) should be supplemented
- c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)

7. Title of the manuscript is correct and corresponding to the text yes no

8. The conclusions:

- a) are correct and resulted from research presented in the paper
- b) should be supplemented

c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)

9. The references included recent publications (especially from the last two years) and are:

a) sufficient

b) insufficient

10. Manuscript language:

a) is correct

b) should be edited

c) is incorrect

12. Overall assessment

a) **very good – submit without any amendments**

b) **good - submit with an amendments**

c) **submit corrected paper without second review**

d) **submit corrected paper after second review**

e) **poor – unable to publish**

11. To the best of my knowledge, the paper had been already published in the same or similar form yes no

The place for comments – especially for issues which should be supplemented and/or corrected

- The quantity of customers in Banjarbar and Banjar district (62 million) is unbelievable. Did not the author/s make a mistake? (first sentence in introduction).
- Author/s should unify units used in article.
- References to literature need improvement.
- The order of article parts need improvement. For example the summary part should be before the references part.
- Table 2 need more clarification.
- What is the purpose of the research used by author/s of the article?
- Water treatment plant model, which is used in statistical analysis, is insufficiently characterized.
- There are some editorial errors, e.g.: typically the capital letter is at the beginning of the sentence.
- What is the main conclusion of the article?

The reviewer' name only for Editorial Office knowledge. The names of the reviewers assisting the editorial board will be listed in the last issue of each year and in the web.

Date....5.06.2017.....

Reviewer signature

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Address:

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering-WULS

SGGW w Warszawie

ul. Nowoursynowska 159

02-776 WARSAW

POLAND

tel.(022) 59 35 248, 240, 225, 210

e-mail: iks_pn@sggw.pl

02-07-2017

I would kindly ask to review the following manuscript submitted to "Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences" using following questionnaire/form.

Office Secretary
(Katarzyna Pawluk)

No., title of manuscript: *The Model Relationship of Wastes for Parameter Design with Green Lean Production of Fresh Water*

1. The paper:
- a) represents scientific level (the tests results and conclusions are presented; there are the "methodology" and "results" sections)
 - b) represents popular science level (contains new ideas)
 - c) does not represent scientific level and/or does not contain new ideas

If you choose the "c" please do not fill in the rest of the form.

2. The research methods:
- a) are correct and properly described
 - b) should be supplemented and/or described in more detail
 - c) are incorrect
3. The analysis and synthesis of results:
- a) are correct
 - b) should be supplemented
 - c) are incorrect
4. The statistical approaches:
- a) are correct
 - b) should be supplemented
 - c) have incorrect assumption
 - d) are needless
5. Tables and figures:
- a) are correct; have descriptions
 - correct; do not have descriptions
 - should be supplemented
 - d) are inappropriate
6. The abstract and key words:
- a) are correct
 - b) should be supplemented

c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)
7. Title of the manuscript is correct and corresponding to the text yes no

8. The conclusions:
a) are correct and resulted from research presented in the paper

b) should be supplemented

c) are inappropriate (they do not reflect the essence of the tests results)

9. The references included recent publications (especially from the last two years) and are:

a) sufficient

b) insufficient

10. Manuscript language:

a) is correct

b) should be edited

c) is incorrect

12. Overall assessment

a) **very good – submit without any amendments**

b) **good - submit with an amendments**

c) **submit corrected paper without second review**

d) **submit corrected paper after second review**

e) **poor – unable to publish**

11. To the best of my knowledge, the paper had been already published in the same or similar form yes no

The place for comments – especially for issues which should be supplemented and/or corrected

In my opinion the order of article parts need improvement. The summary part should be before the references part.

The reviewer' name only for Editorial Office knowledge. The names of the reviewers assisting the editorial board will be listed in the last issue of each year and in the web.

Date....2.07.2017.....

Reviewer signature

Source details

Feedback Compare sources

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

Scopus coverage years: from 2013 to 2016

Publisher: Warsaw University of Life Sciences Press

ISSN: 1732-9353

Subject area: Earth and Planetary Sciences: Geotechnical Engineering and Engineering Geology

Set document alert Journal Homepage

Visit Scopus Journal Metrics

CiteScore 2016 0.16

SJR 2015 0.128

SNIP 2015 0.135

CiteScore CiteScore rank & trend Scopus content coverage

CiteScore 2016

Calculated on 23 May, 2017

CiteScore rank

CiteScore 2016

Calculated on 23 May, 2017

CiteScore rank

0.16 = $\frac{\text{Citation Count 2016}}{\text{Documents 2013 - 2015}^*}$ = $\frac{18 \text{ Citations}}{113 \text{ Documents}}$

*CiteScore includes all available document types

View CiteScore methodology CiteScore FAQ

In category: Geotechnical Engineering and ...

Percentiles 20th Rank: #134/167

View CiteScore trends

CiteScoreTracker 2017

Last updated on 23 May, 2017 Updated monthly

0.03 = $\frac{\text{Citation Count 2017}}{\text{Documents 2014 - 2016}}$ = $\frac{4 \text{ Citations to date}}{115 \text{ Documents to date}}$

Metrics displaying this icon are compiled according to Snowball Metrics, a collaboration between industry and academia.

About Scopus











What is Scopus
Content coverage

Language

日本語に切り替える
切换到简体中文

Customer Service

Help
Contact us

165	Przegląd Menopauzalny 	journal	0.200 Q3	9	39	201	1363	98	199	0.79	34.95	
166	Psychology of Language and Communication 	journal	0.200 Q2	5	18	51	747	12	51	0.03	41.50	
167	Archives of Polish Fisheries 	journal	0.199 Q4	9	21	81	1050	38	80	0.33	50.00	
168	Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences	journal	0.198 Q3	2	46	113	847	18	113	0.16	18.41	
169	Filozofia Nauk	journal	0.197 Q2	3	23	103	985	8	100	0.08	38.48	
170	Acta Neuropsychologica	journal	0.195 Q4	9	28	78	774	23	78	0.40	27.64	
171	Engineering Transactions	journal	0.195 Q3	4	55	71	740	26	68	0.35	13.45	

INDONESIA, JUNE 12 2017

(place, date)

MASTIADI TAMJIDILLAH

PhD student of Mechanical Engineering of Brawijaya University - Indonesia
Mechanical Engineering Dept of Lambung Mangkurat University - Indonesia
Name of the author making the declaration, an organization affiliated paper

Pratikto

Purnomo Budi Santoso

Sugiono

Names of the co-authors of the paper (if more than one author)

DECLARATION


I declare as author / co-author¹ of the article entitled:

THE MODEL RELATIONSHIP OF WASTE FOR PARAMETER DESIGN
WITH GREEN LEAN PRODUCTION OF FRESH WATER

submitted for publication in Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences that:

- this paper has not been previously published or submitted for publication elsewhere,
- I wrote the paper alone / in cooperation with the other co-authors¹,
- text of the paper or materials contained therein does not infringe the copyright, legal interests and property of others,
- I declare that I am aware of the concept of "ghostwriting" and "guest authorship", which - in this case - are not applied,
- if the paper was prepared with other co-authors mentioned earlier, I informed them about the conditions contained in this statement and I am authorized by all of them to sign this statement on their behalf.

If the paper is accepted for publication I agree to transfer my copyright to the Publisher of Warsaw University of Life Sciences. I agree to place my correspondence data and paper on the website of the Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences and also in the databases cooperating with the Publisher according to the Creative Commons CC BY-NC license.



MASTIADI TAMJIDILLAH

(signature)

¹ underline the appropriate

Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences

ISSN 1732-9353

eISSN 2543-7496

Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering WULS

Nowoursynowska 159

02-776 Warsaw, POLAND

tel.+48 (022) 59 35 248, 240, 225, 210

e-mail: iks_pn@sggw.pl

http://iks_pn.sggw.pl/

Warsaw, 12-07-2017

Dear Mastiadi Tamjidillah,

on behalf of the Editorial board of Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences, I announce you, that your manuscript entitled "*The Model Relationship of Wastes for Parameter Design with Green Lean Production of Fresh Water*" has been accepted for publishing in Issue 4(78), Vol. 26 2017.

Katarzyna Pawluk PhD Eng.



Scientific Review Engineering and Environmental Sciences