

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_100769
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF POTABLE WATER SUPPLY IN AKURE NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, ONDO STATE, NIGERIA
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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it allows to highlight health related to the use of water intended for consumption.</p> <p>Yes title acceptable</p> <p>Understandable but with elements to correct</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>scientifically correct manuscript</p> <p>yes the references are adapted to the manuscripts and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Acceptable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>1-Very long summary rephrase in maximum 250 words</p> <p>2- in the summary we must have a context, an applied methodology and some results obtained</p> <p>3- The summary does not clearly present some elements taken into account in the questionnaire, the duration of the study period at the end clearly present some results obtained and recommendation</p> <p>4- No more than 5 keywords</p> <p>5-at the level of the introduction, talk about your previous work that has been carried out and at the end clearly highlight the problem of your work</p> <p>-at the level of the literature review</p> <p>Rephrase the first paragraph because it expresses the same idea as the first paragraph of the introduction</p> <p>Many target objectives express the same ideas Reformulate them into a maximum of 5 objectives</p> <p>-at the level of methodology</p> <p>5-Speak briefly about the nature of the soils and the vegetation of the environment and the duration of the study period and clearly announce your figures, modify figure 2 because the coordinates are illegible and therefore very vague</p> <p>6- redo your tables well because the figures intersect and end up in inappropriate areas (table 1 and 2)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Results and discussion</p> <p>7- better to redo the table 3,4,5,6,7 and 8 because not only are they blurred but the figures intersect (are not in the exact positions) and merge, review figure 5</p> <p>8- Figures 4 and 5, 6 and 7 must be improved and well positioned</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>1-Very long summary rephrase in maximum 250 words</p> <p>2- in the summary we must have a context, an applied methodology and some results obtained</p> <p>3- The summary does not clearly present some elements taken into account in the questionnaire, the duration of the study period at the end clearly presents some results obtained and recommendation</p> <p>4- No more than 5 keywords</p> <p>5-at the level of the introduction, talk about your previous work that has been carried out and at the end clearly highlight the problem of your work</p> <p>At the level of the literature review</p> <p>6-Rephrase the first paragraph because it expresses the same idea as the first paragraph of the introduction</p> <p>7-Many target objectives express the same ideas Reformulate them into a maximum of 5 objectives</p> <p>-at the level of methodology</p> <p>8-Speak briefly about the nature of the soils and the vegetation of the environment and the duration of the study period and clearly announce your figures, modify figure 2 because the coordinates are illegible and therefore very vague</p> <p>9- redo your tables well because the figures intersect and end up in inappropriate areas (table 1 and 2)</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>10- better to redo the table 3,4,5,6,7 and 8 because not only are they blurred but the figures intersect (are not in the exact positions) and merge, review figure 5</p> <p>11- Figures 4 and 5, 6 and 7 must be improved and well positioned</p> <p>The conclusion</p> <p>12-It must be done in a single paragraph, reformulate it well, taking into account the general objective, the methodology, the main results obtained and any recommendations if possible.</p> <p>13-Adopt a unique style for your references check that they are indeed in the right place in your text</p> <p>14- Proofread and correct mistakes in your manuscript</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noah Ewoti Olive Vivien
Department, University & Country	University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon