

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_96918
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Industrial Water Pollution on Human and Livestock Health in Bhavani River basin of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. In the introduction should talk more about other related research in the study area, their gaps. How to overcome those gaps which could be the basis of your study?</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Try to add recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Check all grammar mistakes, and syntax errors,..</p> <p>2. Check all the references if were well written</p> <p>3. Improve the introduction part</p> <p>4. Few references in the introduction part. You should explore many studies to provide the progress, lacks in the study area.</p> <p>5. I have suggested some correction. Check in the entire manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. This research was conducted during 2 years, you should identify the types and the main dominating pollutants in your study area.</p> <p>2. It is suggested that some results to be presented in terms of Figures (showing that increment and marginal situation) not only tables.</p> <p>3. This research was conducted during 2 years, you should identify the types and the main dominating pollutants in your study area</p> <p>4. Writing style should be consistent for the entire manuscript</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:	Telesphore Habiyakare
Department, University & Country	School of Engineering, University of Rwanda, Rwanda