

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJOCS_117756
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Investigated Levels Physicochemical Parameters in Qua Iboe River, Oruk Anam, Nigeria with Portable Water Standards
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>-The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community. It presents novel findings that advance our understanding in the field, offering new insights and methodologies that could be pivotal for future research.</p> <p>-Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>-Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. -Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>-Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The research methodology is sound, and the data analysis is thorough and well-documented. -Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>-Check the spacing between the words throughout all the text. -The sentence is not complete "This temperature range supports the survival of aquatic plants and animals and???" in the study area."</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Djabourabi Aicha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chadli Bendjedid University, Algeria</b>