

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_90616
Title of the Manuscript:	WATER QUALITY DOWNSTREAM OF CIMANUK RIVER, WEST JAVA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is recommend to present a paper with article structure in the style of "IMRADC", that is 1. Introduction; 2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure specifically designed (optional); 3. Method; 4. Results and Discussions; 5. Conclusions. 2) Part of Introduction: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction have to contain the following parts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the SoTA (State-of-The Art) of the field the report is about. b. The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient. c. Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references are referred in this section. Reference year should be less than 5 years from now. 3) Part of Method: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists. 4) Part of Results and discussion: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references. 5) About Figures & Tables in your manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be referenced in the text. Authors must explain what the reader should look for when using the table or figure. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own. b. Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed. c. All figures must in high quality images. Use different patterns for presenting different results in your figures/graphics (instead of different colors). It is mandatory!! 6) Part of Conclusion: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward? <p>Please ensure that all references have been cited in your text. Use a tool such as EndNote, Mendeley, or Zotero for reference management and formatting, and choose IEEE style. Each citation should be written in the order of appearance in the text in square brackets.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is better if your findings are compared with the phenomenon as well as the results of studies in other similar areas or compared with the results of other researchers for the Cimanuk region. What are the similarities and differences, to confirm that your findings are true. Add the narration in the Result and Discussions. 2) The validation of the measurement results for the parameters used is also not mentioned. Comparison with existing Government Regulations also lacks an analysis of why this happened and how to overcome it. So that this article seems like a short report. Need to sharpen the analysis of the results. Can be compared with the results of research in other areas or the results of research in that area by other researchers. 3) References need to be added. Reference year should be less than 5 years from now. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, this paper needs to be rewritten to fulfill a scientific paper. The structure of the writing of this paper is less impressive than scientific writing, and looks like a measurement report only.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Dimyati
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia