

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102751
Title of the Manuscript:	SPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF GROUNDWATER USING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) AND WATER QUALITY INDEX (WQI) IN YENAGOA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Dear Editor Thank you for selecting me as one of your Journal reviewer. Before reviewing, I read all general guideline of the Journal then I did it. This suggestion offer with respect to the researcher since It is obvious that they did their best and spent time for this manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I think yes it is since the researcher try to gather useful data and had a good suggestion for solving the problem. Yes, it is. The structure of the abstract was not based on the criteria of the journal :aim, methodology, result and conclusion This manuscript has no Discussion part. Honestly, the text should be corrected from a literary and grammatical point of view. Figures had no brief explanation and Tables except 2 of them had no explanation, too. It might be a good idea to get help of a native editor. For methodology part, With respect I suggest to send this manuscript to one of specialist in Water analysis who is one of international reviewer: Mr Mahmood Yousefi with contact email (yousefi.eng70@gmail.com) Yes, it is. <p><u>Some additional comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In this manuscript, some criterion were not observed: a) number of pages(more than 25 pages), b) number of tables & figures(more than 15), c) style of references in text(no bracket with number) It might be a good idea to correct keyword part (delete "and")and add Inverse Distance Weighted since it used in text The abstract can be write better especially in result part At the first of introduction, starting with "water pollution importance" and at the end of it, finishing with "purpose of study" are my suggestion for getting better this part. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	-	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Manizhe Pakdel
Department, University & Country	Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Iran