

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This article could potentially provide an insight into the effect of human intervention on water quality. However it was poorly written and need major restructuring	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, Instead of effect of sewage why don't the author/authors focus on human anthropogenic activities	
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.	Since major restructuring is required abstract therefore has to be rewritten	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not in proper flow. I don't quite like the flow and choice of sections no connection	
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.	No comment on this as citations is poorly written. Citations mark with red colour is questionable. Please check if they are in the correct style of writing usually only authors' last name followed by year of publication applies for citations	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Citations are okay but I suggest authors to add a few more in areas where I have make track changes	
Minor REVISION comments	Poorly written consider rewriting the article so it give a proper flow	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M Wanlambok Sanglyne
Department, University & Country	Bio-Resources Development Centre, India