

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	Original scientific 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is very important for the scientific community The title conveys the purpose of the study Yes, the summary is quite complete -In the introduction, that the author gives towards the end a small summary of his study in 2 or 3 sentences. -That the author introduces a small nomenclature between the abstract and the introduction, this will make the understanding of his work more interesting for those who are not exactly in the field. Yes, it is scientifically correct but the previous suggestions will improve it I appreciate the references because they are diverse and some are recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, she's quite strong	
Optional/General comments	After taking into account these few suggestions, once this document is published, it will arouse great interest in the scientific community.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalifa Palm
Department, University & Country	Institut de Recherche en Sciences Appliquées et Technologies, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Burkina Faso