

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_103341
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Ground Water Pollution with Heavy Metals in Al-Zaatari area, North Jordan
Type of the Article	Review 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://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript addresses the issue of groundwater pollution near a refuge camp. It is important to scientific community.</p> <p>2. The Title is not suitable. It is suggested to read: Assessment of impact of Zaatari refugee camp on groundwater pollution by heavy metals in Al-Zaatari area, North Jordan,</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. It has been corrected as shown on the attached edited manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but are mostly not recent. Most of the references range from 2001 to 2009 i.e. between 14 to 22 years. The author should search for more recent articles and update the references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English has been corrected to make it suitable for publication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The author will find the reviewed manuscript useful. The suggested corrections are highlighted in red.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adelere Ezekiel Adeniran
Department, University & Country	Babcock University, Nigeria