

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- Yes, This article is important for river basin management. Also both some of water quality parameters and heavy metals are important river basin. 2- Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3- The abstract can be written more scientifically. Also the author can write "water quality parameter" on keyword 4-The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5-Yes 6- The references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is suitable	
Optional/General comments	The article is acceptable	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nedim Özdemir
Department, University & Country	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Turkey