

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_100343
Title of the Manuscript:	POLLUTION ASSESSMENT OF PRIVATE BORE-HOLES WATER SUPPLY USING CONTAMINATION INDEX AND CONTOUR IN OGBIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA.
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)
<p>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Water pollution is a major issue facing today. So the manuscript deals with a relevant topic for scientific community.</p> <p>In the title and in the manuscript, the word Bore hole can be replaced with Bore well.</p> <p>The abstract is too lengthy. It can be made more brief.</p> <p>Yes. The structure of the manuscript is well organized.</p> <p>The author had tried to find out the contamination of the Bore Hole water in a scientific way. But the standards of water quality he had taken is of WHO 2011 or 2012. It is confusing in the manuscript.</p> <p>The references must be in the same pattern and more references can be added from recent years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are many simple mistakes in spellings, pH and full form of NSDWQ. Many sentences can be modified in a simple way. Hence, the quality of English has to be improved more for Scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article can be made more impressive by avoiding the repetition of the data in tables, sentences and in figures. The author can select any of these two. Please check the values of Mg in Table 3. It shows like 6.66667E-05. Is this correct?</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beena Kumari K S
Department, University & Country	All Saints' College, University of Kerala, India