Qeios

Peer Review

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

Fengyi Zhu[1]

1. Royal lnstitute of Technology, Sweden

The abstract is overly descriptive and lacks key quantitative findings. Since the manuscript is a modeling and techno-economic study, the abstract should report the main numerical results, such as TP removal and estimated phosphorus recovery under each scenario, rather than relying only on qualitative conclusions.

The Introduction contains several broad claims regarding global phosphorus scarcity, nutrient recovery practices, the Indian sanitation context, and the limitations of DEWATS, but these claims are not supported by citations in the Introduction section itself. Relevant references should be added to support the background, establish the state of the art, and position the study in the existing literature.

Section 2.1 is overly narrative and partly repeats material that belongs in the Introduction or Discussion. The methodological section should be more concise and more clearly structured.

Abbreviations should be used consistently. Once defined, they should generally be used throughout the manuscript rather than repeatedly restating the full term.

The Conclusion is too long and reads partly like an extension of the Discussion. It should be shortened and focused more clearly on the main findings, rather than introducing further discussion with multiple references.

doi.org/10.32388/XYJoLK

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.