

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_118614
Title of the Manuscript:	GROUNDWATER QUALITY OF REGIONS SURROUNDING THE NOYYAL RIVER IN TIRUPPUR DISTRICT AND ITS IMPACT ON AGRICULTURE
Type of the Article	Research

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

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but some results captured are not there in result section</p> <p>Yes, but some needs modification</p> <p>No</p> <p>No, because most references are more than 10 years and is outdate</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, it needs high language refinement</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The techniques employed in this study make it impossible to quantify objectively how agriculture is affected by water quality. • The introduction does not convey the research gap in a straightforward manner. • The materials and procedures are not arranged chronologically; for instance, the introduction's description of the study area needs to come before the materials and methods. • The term 'methodology' is extensive and goes beyond the term 'materials and techniques'. • There is ambiguity and inconsistency in the study design and data collection methods. • The researchers concentrated on the quality and impact of ground water, but the selection factor was distance from the river, which looks to be a study on river water. This makes the site selection technique unconvincing. • The materials and methods did not provide the laboratory protocol that was utilized to analyze the physicochemical characteristics. • The effect of water quality on agriculture is not discussed; rather, the researcher merely made a statement that might have an impact on agricultural, regardless of whether it has anything to do with water quality. Regression analysis or other multivariate analysis is necessary, at the very least, to accomplish it. • It would be preferable to use the laboratory results in WQI calculation rather than the farmer's response. • The water quality index results are not well discussed in comparison with other similar studies • In my opinion, a better indicator for agriculture would have been to concentrate on nutrients like nitrate, nitrate, total phosphate, and total 	

Review Form 1.7

	ammonia. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results must be supported with the statistical analysis• Most of your conclusion statements are not based on your results• Overall, the approaches employed lack coherence and strength. More language revisions to the paper are also required.	
--	---	--

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:	Mathewos Temesgen
Department, University & Country	Ambo University, Ethiopia