

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_104195
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the quality of undeveloped spring waters consumed directly by the local population of Kasai in the Democratic Republic of Congo
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 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>This manuscript reports simplified analysis on the water quality in a small part of DRC. It is performed under common methodology applied and the results are somewhat discussed with conclusions derived</b></p> <p><b>YES</b></p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>somewhat yes, could be extended/improved but yes</p> <p>sufficient</p> <p>abstract: location description needs to be more understandable, grammar in conclusions need to be improved</p> <p>page 2 please explain SDG 6, in the same lines did authors meant committee of DRC?</p> <p>In the introduction section and information about background studies from the past should be given, were there any similar studies done in this province or other parts of DRC</p> <p>Fig. 1 is in unreadable form, and I can see 8 sampling sites but in the text are given 9, after improvement please take care of resolution as well</p> <p>Section 2.1.4 needs to be improved technically</p> <p>Section 2.1.3 the last part of this description is not relevant (with copyrights)</p> <p>Paragraph below table 2 – unify the style of units given</p> <p>Table 3 entry 0.0+/- is wrongly given, authors also cannot state they detect 0 (zero) concentration (rather it is below LOD of method) The paragraph below table 3 please improve description of ions</p> <p>Please use always the same order of samplings sites in tables and to be given with the same style</p> <p>Second paragraph below table 4 – 5 springs with fecal coliforms presence needs rather special attention rather than exclusion from analysis, although all of them should be under careful consideration Does authors really find correlation between toiltets and springwaters in the forest?</p> <p>Style of section 3.1.3 is somewhat different from the rest of manuscript</p> <p>Please rewrite the conclusions to be consistent with the data given in the study, such generalization can be only a part of it, the style of this art must be also improved</p> <p>At least reference 13 and 18 must be corrected and improved, please check carefully other</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Besides the parameters studied some additional would be welcomed, like total hardness, manganese, iron, chlorine, ammonia ions content	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dariusz Guziejewski</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Lodz, Poland</b>