

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121766
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Influence of Sewage Pollution on Pond Water Quality and Ecosystem Health
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper may include also studies in the other Asian region. Especially in the Southeast Asia. There are studies on water quality, including detection of heavy metals in rivers and its implication to the ecosystem. This paper, after a thorough consideration, will be a good way of telling people to care for their environment and do changes to make the water good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs revision, need to improve the discussion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper makes a good way of telling the readers to do something about the pollution on the ponds and its effect to the ecosystem. However, as I have suggested, more studies are also needed to fully gave details on the importance of managing the pond ecosystem.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, it is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments	The English language is Okay.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Need to add more recent studies.	

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:	Flyndon Mark S. Dagalea
Department, University & Country	University Of Eastern Philippines, Philippines