

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received: 22/06/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 05/09/2018
Manuscript Title: Etude Comparative De Deux Garnitures (Noix De Pain De Singe Et De Jujube) Dans Une Colonne Garnie : Hydrodynamique Et Transfert De Matière	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0550/18	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are several grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the text: a careful reading by the authors is required to correct them.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The experimental protocol is well explained regarding the characterization of the column properties. However a description of the methods used for the characterization of the initial</i>	

<i>materials (Table I) is missing. See also my comments to the authors.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>I find confusing to provide only results for “pain de singe” and not for “jujube” for most of the parameters (except the last one, (CO)).</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>I think it is confusing to cite the references with names and year in the text and list them with numbering in the section “Références”.</i>	
<i>I suggest citing all authors names rather than “et al.” in the section “Références”.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is in the field of chemical engineering of biofilters, and provide a comparison of two materials used as fillers in a three-phase reactor. The objectives of the paper are well defined and it provides clear results and a rational conclusion. For these reasons, it is worth to be published in ESJ.

Please find below several remarks that may help to improve the paper before publication.

1. Il manque beaucoup de détails concernant la caractérisation des matériaux initiaux. Quelles mesures ont été effectuées ? Sur combien d'échantillons ? Quelle est la variabilité de ces mesures ?
2. Il faudrait avoir une réflexion sur le nombre de chiffres significatifs présentés pour les diverses propriétés. Par exemple, dans le Tableau I, le diamètre en mm est donné avec 3 chiffres après la virgule, soit au μm près.
3. Il y a des problèmes dans la numérotation des équations ainsi que des figures (la figure 2 n'existe pas).

4. Il est mentionné juste avant la conclusion que le pain de singe donne de bons résultats par rapport à la littérature : pourquoi ne pas fournir une comparaison explicite entre vos résultats et ceux disponibles pour d'autres garnissage ?
5. Il faudrait fournir une échelle pour les photographies des Figure 1 et 3.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

