

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IRJPAC_103974</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Selected Water Quality Parameters in Olomodoi/Okame/Ndambuk River, Busia County, Kenya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalirpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes. Indeed, research on Kenyan waters is limited, making this manuscript can be significant for publication</p> <p>No. The title requires revision; please refer to the comments provided in the MS</p> <p>The abstract is overly long; it should be shortened to 250 words.</p> <p>The subsections are acceptable</p> <p>Yes. Indeed, proper proofreading is necessary before resubmitting the manuscript. Several sections contain grammar mistakes</p> <p>The manuscript includes old references. I recommend the authors to consider using more recent papers</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Proper proofreading is necessary before resubmitting the manuscript. Several sections contain grammar mistakes, the authors should take serious attention on this issue, and try to rectify it.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Kindly see the MS, the comments were provided in an appropriate section with proper track changes.</p> <p>Major comments: The figures should revise based on the comments raised in the MS (Box plot would be good illustration tool instead of Bar graph)</p> <p>Lack of language writing so I suggest the authors should go once for proper proofreading before resubmission.</p> <p>Overall, this MS needed more modifications and rework so my suggestion would be "Serious Major revision"</p>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. S. Sathishkumar
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Coastal Research, India