

Peer Review

Review of: "Phosphorus Recovery Potential from Decentralised Wastewater Treatment Systems in India: A Constrained Mass-Balance Study of Auroville"

Muhammad Burhanuddin Bahrodin¹

1. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

1. I think this manuscript is a copy-paste from a thesis. I did run Turnitin, and the similarity is up to 92%. Rephrase the sentences that were taken directly from the thesis.
2. For the introduction section, the introduction is too general. May include a few inputs from previous studies and cite previous studies.
3. The objective of this study is not clear. Commonly, the objective of the study is at the end of the introduction, but I don't think it's there.
4. I noticed there are a few ways of writing that reflect how you write in a thesis. For example, in the methodology section, you used "this chapter..."; and it is not suitable for a paper.
5. Your methodology is too lengthy and too literature-oriented. Some input can be transferred to the introduction section. The methodology section should straight away narrate how you carried out the study. Lengthy explanation is not required.
6. In the results and discussion section, I notice you cited papers for your results. For example, "The system demonstrates high efficacy in organic matter ranging between 78% and 91% [11,12]". This is your result, right? Why does it have a citation? There are other parts that have a similar problem.
7. The graph needs to be redrawn to make it sharper.
8. The discussion section is okay.
9. Overall, I find it difficult to understand what your research is about. Reduce lengthy sentences to make it easier to understand. Consider rewriting the manuscript.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.