Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_116380**
Title of the Manuscript:	**GEOELECTRICAL AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION AROUND A CASSAVA PROCESSING FACTORY IN OGBOMOSO, SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA**
Type of the Article	**Research**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and professionals working in environmental science, hydrogeology, and pollution control. It addresses a pressing issue of groundwater contamination around a cassava processing factory and waste dumpsite in Southwestern Nigeria. 2. Yes the title of the article appears suitable and accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. It clearly indicates the main focus of the research, which involves both geoelectrical (resistivity surveying) and physic-chemical (water quality analysis) characterization methods to assess groundwater contamination in the vicinity of a cassava processing factory. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the research methodology, including the use of 2D resistivity profiling and hydro-geochemical analyses to assess groundwater contamination around a cassava processing factory in Southwestern Nigeria. 4. Following the introduction, there should be a materials and methodology section. The author has provided details about the methodology used; however, it would benefit the scientific community to have a dedicated section outlining the materials used, especially for their study. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and comprehensive in its approach to assessing groundwater contamination near a cassava processing factory. The abstract succinctly summarizes the methodology, findings, and implications of the study, providing a clear overview for readers. 6. The references included in the manuscript address pertinent aspects of groundwater contamination, yet to ensure the robustness of the literature review, it's crucial to incorporate recent and comprehensive sources. Given that heavy metal pollution is a significant concern in groundwater, augmenting the references with recent studies on heavy metal toxicity in water or the efficacy of plants in adsorbing these contaminants could bolster the manuscript's credibility and relevance. Below are some suggested references: Singh, A., Sharma, A., Verma, R. K., Chopade, R. L., Pandit, P. P., Nagar, V., ... & Sankhla, M. S. (2022). Heavy metal contamination of water and their toxic effect on living organisms. In *The toxicity of environmental pollutants*. IntechOpen. Manwani, S., Sharma, A., Bhoot, N., Awasthi, A., & Awasthi, G. (2022). Comparative analysis of different chemical and biological adsorbents for the reduction of arsenic and mercury from vegetable species in the Sanganer, Jaipur. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, *69*, 1548-1555. Aseri, V., Nagar, V., Sharma, A., Singh, A., Sankhla, M. S., & Awasthi, K. K. (2024). Status of Arsenic Contamination in Paddy Fields: Soil Water Chemistry. In *Arsenic in Rice* (pp. 27-46). Apple Academic Press.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The text is clear, concise, and effectively conveys scientific information. However, minor grammatical and punctuation errors can be found throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading to correct these issues would enhance the readability and professionalism of the article. Overall, with some minor improvements, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communication.	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	• While the content is detailed and informative, the manuscript could benefit from clearer structuring, particularly in the Results and Discussion section. Breaking down the findings into subsections with clear headings could enhance readability and help readers navigate the complex data more easily. • The interpretation of the results is thorough, but some sections could be expanded to provide deeper insights. For example, discussing the potential sources of contamination in more detail and considering the implications of the findings for environmental management and public health could strengthen the discussion. • providing detailed captions for each figure/table would help readers understand their significance without needing to refer back to the main text.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anuj Sharma**
Department, University & Country	**ITM University, India**