

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_108405
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Seasonal Changes on Water Physicochemical Properties Along Njoro River and Lake Nakuru, Kenya
Type of the Article	Research article

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article holds significance in its specific geographic context and offers valuable insights for the scientific community concerned with water quality, environmental science, and ecosystem well-being. Its relevance might also reach into broader conversations about water resource management in areas facing comparable environmental conditions and human-induced pressures. However, for the research to have a more widespread impact, it should explicitly address its potential applicability to other regions and offer a deeper exploration of its findings with additional context.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is generally suitable for the content of the research, but somewhat long and may benefit from simplification for better readability. For instance, a more concise title like "Seasonal Variations in Water Quality in Njoro River and Lake Nakuru, Kenya" might be more reader-friendly.</p> <p>3. While the abstract does offer a good overview of the article, enhancing its comprehensiveness could involve incorporating additional context, clarifying the relevance of the methods to the research question, and specifying quantitative findings. Such enhancements would render the abstract even more informative.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure align with the specific requirements of the target journal or publication.</p> <p>5. The presentation of analysis results in the form of curves is incorrect. Point results cannot be interpolated. All graphs need to be redone in the form of scatterplots.</p> <p>6. Overall, the references appear to be suitable for a scientific research paper.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language and English quality of the article seem generally suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While the article provides valuable insights into water quality in the Njoro River and Lake Nakuru, there are opportunities for improvement in terms of clarity, data presentation, and contextualization of findings. Additionally, addressing the limitations of the study and expanding the discussion section could strengthen the overall impact of the research.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahmoud Bali
Department, University & Country	Higher Institute of Water Sciences and Techniques, Tunisia