

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_127757
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICOCHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN WATER SOURCES NEAR MAJOR DUMPSITES AND CONTROL AREAS IN KARU-ABUJA AND PARTS OF NASARAWA STATE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is well structured and well-planned. Some aspects of the study is well-pointed and some lacks the pace. Here, in this context, presentation and methods are well implemented.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. But highlight the study results and polish the language. I prefer that author needs to re-write again for a better output.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references are not properly described. Studies are absent in the literature review.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But at some places, it lacks the novelty.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments to Author:</p> <p>1: The abstract should be modified.</p> <p>2: The introduction needs to be oriented properly as per the work. Studies should be implemented wherever necessary with citations.</p> <p>3: The graphs are not clear. It should be drawn again. All graphs clarity is poor.</p> <p>4: Methods are obsolete. Recommended to use any optimization tools and compare the results.</p> <p>5. ML algorithms should be used and confusion matrix can be build up to explain the results.</p> <p>6. The results part is not good. Studies on parameters with relevant comparison needs to be done. Interpolated graphs are necessary for each parameter.</p> <p>7: Limitations, implications, recommendations needs to be add with 2-3 points each.</p> <p>8: Conclusion is ok. Needs to be pointed.</p> <p>9: Cite the journals of 2024 and try to incorporate new methods with valid findings.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Abhijeet Das</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>C.V. Raman Global University, India</p>