

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_99379
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Quality Assessment of Nigerian Port Authority Waterway In Port-Harcourt, Rivers State.
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)	1. Yes, the research topic is very interesting. 2. Yes. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
Optional/General comments	The job shows a complete statistical description. In addition to descriptive statistics, an exploratory analysis was done using a dendrogram. It would be necessary to clarify why the Pearson coefficient (highlighted in yellow) is chosen with so few samples (do the continuous observed variables have a normal distribution?). Perhaps you would apply some statistical methodology (hypothesis tests) to draw conclusions since the exploratory analysis only shows sample results.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Laura Patat
Department, University & Country	National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina