

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_97486
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Municipal Dumpsite on Neighbouring Boreholes
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://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/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. It is a study of a specific case. The results in general are not discussed with parameters that have been found in that place or with investigations carried out in similar places. In several sections of the work they make statements that do not have references and this is very important, to enrich the work.</p> <p>2. In the Title of the work, I recommend specifying the place where the study was carried out. Study is site specific.</p> <p>3. Yes, only you should write mL, L, in all the work</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. No. the Authors should do more discussion of results</p> <p>7. They only have 9 references, of which 2, the most recent are from 2012 Figure 1 should be more specific to the study area. There should not be a title at the top of the Figure, since it is already below. The same to Figure 2 to 8. Table 2 does not have relevant information, I suggest it be deleted The variables of equation 1, 2, 3 must be described in the same way as they are presented in equation In Table 3.....the information is not relevant What is the meaning of NS in Table 4 The information from Figures 2 to 8 must be presented in such a way that they group the information from those 7 Figures into one or two maximum</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language yes, but the writing no, there are observations in the document</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María del Carmen Carreño de León
Department, University & Country	National Technological of Mexico, Mexico