

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_95353
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Quality Assessment of Karnaphuli River of Bangladesh using CCME-WQI Method
Type of the 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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, since it evaluates the contamination of a part of one of the most important rivers of Bangladesh and that is of capital importance in the economic, social and cultural development of the country. 2. The title of the article seems appropriate to me. I think there is no reason to change it. 3. I consider that the abstract of the article contains the most relevant information of the entire document 4. When analyzing the article, it seemed to me that they contain appropriate subsections and the structure of the manuscript seems organized 5. The manuscript can be considered scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient, but not recent. Some of them are incomplete like 7, 8, 10, 13 and 23 7. It is suggested in the graphs of each evaluated parameter to put a line that represents the admissible limits of each parameter, both from the regulations of Bangladesh and the Canadian one that is given to evaluate the CCME-WQI method.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used is understandable and sufficient for most readers to understand the purpose and results of the article.	
Optional/General comments	It is suggested in the graphs of each evaluated parameter to put a line that represents the admissible limits of each parameter, both from the regulations of Bangladesh and the Canadian one that is given to evaluate the CCME-WQI method.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico