

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98105
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of water quality in Ganga river ghats of Varanasi district, Uttar Pradesh
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community. It is okay, but proper title characters like what I have below. Assessment of Water Quality in Ganga River Ghats of Varanasi District, Uttar Pradesh Comprehensive.</p> <p>I have made a few observations with appropriate corrections</p> <p>It is scientifically correct.</p> <p>In the references, the author should stick to a particular style of referencing as agreed by this journal, because at some point you see Authors then date of publication for journal and other places journal name before date of publication. Stick to a particular reference style.</p> <p>All tables are either presented before each discussions or taken to the appendix where there are attached appendices. You don't start discussions and now put table after discussions and continue discussions again.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable	
Optional/General comments	<p><i>In all your discussions references were not made to other standards like WHO and FDA or other EPA which could be used as a standard to measure if the parameters were to be used internationally.</i></p> <p><i>Comparison of your data should be made with other authors or previous work done even if it is not in Uttah Pradesh but other places with a scientific explanation as to why there as discrepancies and same data.</i></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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Destiny Erhabor
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Nigeria