MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND SCIENCES POSTGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE (MESPIC) 2016

REVIEW FORM (TO THE AUTHOR)

Manuscript Title:

MODEL OPTIMAZATION OF PARAMETER PROCESS MIXING IN WATER TREATMENT

Assessment:

1	=	Poor
2	=	Below Average
3	=	Average
4	=	Good
5	=	Excellent
N/A	=	Not applicable (x)

a) Is this article based on rigorous research? 3

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
It is based on rigorous academic standards	x	1	2	3	4	5

b) Is the article presented in a format that is accessible by practitioners? 2

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
It focuses on justification, results and implementation; has readable style; technical material in appendix	x	1	2	3	4	5

c) Does the article have clarity of presentation? 1

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Well organised, clearly written	x	1	2	3	4	5

d) Does the article make a significant contribution to the body of knowledge related to this conference? 4

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Highly significance, breaks new ground, provides a foundation for future research	x	1	2	3	4	5

e) Is the rationale for the article well grounded? 3

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Based on a known theory or on an interesting issue	x	1	2	3	4	5

f) Is the methodology appropriate and applied properly? 3

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Analytical method is appropriate for the study and applied properly	x	1	2	3	4	5

g) Is the material technically accurate? 3

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
The material is technically accurate and sound	x	1	2	3	4	5

h) If this article is a survey, is there evidence of reliability and validity of the constructs?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Strong evidence of reliability and validity provided	x	1	2	3	4	5

i) Discussion of the results: 3

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Discussion is based on analysis of data; results aren't overstated or overgeneralized	x	1	2	3	4	5

Reviewer's comments (please present the specifics)

SUMMARY

The article is quite an interesting research but very poorly presented.

STRENGTH

Quite an interesting work

MINOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

MAJOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

The use of English is so poor. There are many grammatical errors and wrong spelling. Some sentences are hard to comprehend. The errors are highlighted in yellow.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND SCIENCES POSTGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE (MESPIC) 2016

REVIEW FORM (TO THE AUTHOR)

Manuscript Title:	**Model Optimazation of Parameter Process Mixing in Water Treatment**

Assessment:

1	=	Poor
2	=	Below Average
3	=	Average
4	=	Good
5	=	Excellent
N/A	=	Not applicable (x)

a) Is this article based on rigorous research?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
It is based on rigorous academic standards	x	1	2	(3)	4	5

b) Is the article presented in a format that is accessible by practitioners?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
It focuses on justification, results and implementation; has readable style; technical material in appendix	x	1	(2)	3	4	5

c) Does the article have clarity of presentation?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Well organised, clearly written	x	1	(2)	3	4	5

d) Does the article make a significant contribution to the body of knowledge related to this conference?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Highly significance, breaks new ground, provides a foundation for future research	x	1	(2)	3	4	5

e) Is the rationale for the article well grounded?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Based on a known theory or on an interesting issue	x	1	2	(3)	4	5

f) Is the methodology appropriate and applied properly?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Analytical method is appropriate for the study and applied properly	x	1	2	(3)	4	5

g) Is the material technically accurate?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
The material is technically accurate and sound	x	1	(2)	3	4	5

h) If this article is a survey, is there evidence of reliability and validity of the constructs?

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Strong evidence of reliability and validity provided	(x)	1	2	3	4	5

i) Discussion of the results:

	N/a	Poor				Excellent
Discussion is based on analysis of data; results aren't overstated or overgeneralized	x	1	(2)	3	4	5

Reviewer's comments (please present the specifics)

SUMMARY

The paper has the research material. However it needs to be cohesively constructed so that the main issue that the author would like to address in this paper could be delivered effectively. The objectives of the paper were not clearly mentioned in the article. The author should discuss the findings of the research in a more scientific manner, such as compare and contrast the results obtained from the conducted experiment and suggest to the reader which combination parameters that give the most promising results or vice versa. In-example, what does the std deviations of turbidity value of water indicates in Figure 2; What one could observed from the main effect plots in Figure 4 and How do you relate the flock of sedimentation with the water quality in Figure 5. The whole article requires major grammatical checking.

STRENGTH

MINOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

MAJOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

1) Avoid using lengthy sentences; i.e First sentence in the abstract section is of 7 lines words. Suggestion:
The study aims to optimize the mixing process parameters of raw water, alum or its scientific name called Poly Aluminum Chloride (PAC) and pump stroke in the water treatment plant using Taguchi Method. The experimental mixing parameters were set as water;5 lt / sec , 10 lt / sec and 15 lt / sec, alum (% of alum to water);5 ppm, 10 ppm and 15 ppm and the pump stroke installation of 15 % , 20 % and 25 % respectively. .....etc. The whole abstract needs to be re-words.
2) Inconsistency of the terminologies used in the article; Tawas – Alum; Air Baku – Raw water; pump stroke – stroke pompa); select which one that are more appropriate and use them consistently throughout the article.
3) Typo; Table – Tabel?; Flock – Flok?
4) The formulae needs to be re-typed and must be readable.

$$ppm \quad \frac{(lt)hour \times 36250\ ppm}{8\ lt / sec \times 3600\ sec/hour}$$

5) The SEM image in Figure 5 is not clear
6) The article needs quite major grammar checking.
7) The objectives of the paper were not clearly mentioned in the article.