

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_101704
Title of the Manuscript:	The pollution plague of Bharalu: a discrete choice experiment
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.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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it deals with the highly important issue of water pollution. Thus, determining the importance of restoring Bharalu's water quality and people's perception of its pollution in the context of their willingness to pay (WTP) requires an in-depth field investigation.</p> <p>2. The title is quite clear and understandable</p> <p>3. The abstract is not well formulated, as the problematic is too long. The abstract needs to be reformulated, gradually revealing the problem, the aim of the study, the methodology, the results obtained and a brief conclusion.</p> <p>4. The different sections are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is acceptable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In general, the manuscript is well presented. However, the results should be reviewed. At this level, we note that there are still methodological aspects, often with details. In short, you need to make a clear distinction between your results and the methods you use.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Konan-Waidhet Arthur Brice
Department, University & Country	Jean Lorougnon Guede University, Cote D'Ivoire