

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_107388
Title of the Manuscript:	GROUNDWATER QUALITY ANALYSIS IN ELEME METROPOLIS: A PHYSIOCHEMICAL PERSPECTIVE.
Type of the Article	Original 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes thethe manuscript is important for scientific community. Yes the title of the article is suitable. Yes the abstract is very very comprehensive. The structure and subsections of the manuscript are not appropriate according authors guidelines. I think the manuscript is snot scientifically correct. The authors are not discuss their results. The conclusion is not good. The references are not sufficient. Alone seven references are in the text. Authors should refere to authors guidelines to correct the references in the text and at the reference part. The authors should consulted the authors guidelines for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the manuscript The references in the text as in the reference part. Authors should described correctly the study area (geographic coordinates, the climate, relief,vegetation, hydrography, geological formations and socio and economic activities). The authors should make a discussion of results. This is very important. Without discussion, it is not a scientific word. For the methodology paragraph, the authors should make some sentences. They do not describe the methodology by Romain number like i, ii, iii, etc. Sometimes the authors sentences are very long. Theauthors should improve the quality of the article with many references. For groundwater quality assessment, the authors should analyze nitrates. It is an important variable. The use of statistical analysis like principal component (PCA) would help the authors. 	<p>Ation,</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Soro Tanina Drissa
Department, University & Country	University Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d'Ivoire