

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>

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. In this manuscript, the authors try to provide a solution to the possibility of restoration of the Bharalu River in India. The strategy used takes into account the opinion of the population. The strategy is therefore salutary. However, the analysis should take into account a wide range of parameters, which really determines the water quality. Yes, but it would be interesting to improve it by adding a few key results from the article (the problem and methods are explained but there's no overview of the results) The abstract needs to be rewritten. Admittedly, the problem seems well posed and the objectives clearly defined, but the presentation of the salient results is lacking. Revise the title of paragraph 2.1. of the material and method part. I think the title: « Introducing the Bharalu River in Guwahati" would be appropriate. Paragraph 2.2. Defined the term WQI The title of paragraph 2.3 could be for example: sampling strategy The manuscript respects a scientific approach and the strategy used is understandable. References are not enough. Moreover, out of 16 references, 08 are more than 10 years old. We strongly suggest refreshing these references and enriching them. <p>Additional comments: Table 3</p> <p>In several parameters in Table 3, mean is less than the standard deviation. Can you justify that? In a dataset, the mean represents the average or expected value of the observations, while the standard deviation measures the dispersion or spread of the data points around the mean. So, if the mean were to be less than the standard deviation, it would imply that the observations are, on average, more spread out from the mean than the mean itself. This would be mathematically impossible and contradicts the definition and properties of the mean and standard deviation. Therefore, in a valid dataset, the mean cannot be less than the standard deviation.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Based on my review of the article, I would say that the language and English quality of the document are generally suitable for scholarly communications. While there were a few spelling mistakes and some heavy sentences, these issues did not significantly impact the overall understanding of the article. The content and concepts presented were clear and comprehensible. However, I would suggest addressing the spelling mistakes and simplifying complex sentences to improve the readability and overall quality of the language. This will enhance the clarity and accessibility of the article for readers. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Leygnima Yaya Ouattara
Department, University & Country	Felix Houphouët-Boigny National Polytechnic Institute, Cote d'Ivoire