

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118688
Title of the Manuscript:	Groundwater quality assessment with respect to Heavy metal content by using Heavy metal pollution index (HPI) of Moradabad district, Uttar Pradesh, India
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>Compulsory 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>1. Heavy metal pollution in soil and groundwater is a topic debated by researchers around the world.</p> <p>2. The title is well chosen.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and respects the journal's editorial requirements.</p> <p>4. The conditions of the journal for content are respected.</p> <p>5. There is a correct documentation to give a scientific character to the work. The information in the abstract is correctly reflected in the conclusions of the paper.</p> <p>6. References are from 1964-2019. I recommend removing very old references. For reference [17] something newer appears at the link: https://www.cgwb.gov.in/old_website/District_Profile/UP/Moradabad.pdf Reference [20] does not have the year listed (I think it is 1996). I recommend revising the references, respecting the conditions imposed by the journal (where the year of publication is written)</p> <p>I recommend checking the headings for tables 5 and 6 (reordering).</p> <p>I recommend a font change for table 9 and moving the title above the table.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article was easy to understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<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:

Name:	Popa Maria
Department, University & Country	Petroleum-Gas University of Ploiești, România