Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_113943**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ASSESSMENT OF NJABA RIVER QUALITY USING PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PARAMETERS.**
Type of the Article	

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. This paper describes an investigation of the water quality of the Njaba River in Nigeria. By comparing the measured physico-chemical parameters with the regulatory limits the quality is assessed, and recommendations are made to improve the water quality. This results are valuable to guarantee good water quality in the future. 2. The title covers the content of the manuscript. 3. Yes it is comprehensive. I suggest to add the country: Nigeria in the first line, since it is not clear now for international readers. 4. The subsections and structure are appropriate 5. The general line of this manuscript is scientific, although I think it is a bit short, and some details in the methods, results and discussion section can be explained better, which will improve the scientific quality, and increase the value of this study for other readers. Some more explanation is needed for: - In the methods section, it seems that at each sample point multiple samples through time were collected (all in the month may 2023)? It is however not clear how many. From the methodology section I get the impression it is only 1 sample per location. But in the results section standard errors for each sample point are given – please specify how many samples were collected and at which time interval. - In the abstract a Duncan Multiple Range test is mentioned, but neither in the methodology or in the results is it described in detail, please provide this information. - In lines 170 (see attached manuscript) in the discussion section, the variation in turbidity etc is related to rainfall events, I think this is an important and interesting finding. The river water quality is related to runoff, also form agriculture. However, this is not clearly proven from the data, or well described in the manuscript. Please explain the temporal pattern of the samples, and if you have this data, show how the turbidity increases in combination with recent precipitation. - From the manuscript, it is not clear what the difference is between the control point and the other points more downstream? Is the control point before any human activity, and are the other points after specific activities, e.g. sand excavation, the brewery etc? That would make the result even more interesting, and new pollution can be related to specific human activities. Please explain in more detail what the difference between the control and other 4 sample point are. And maybe show the locations of possible pollution sources (brewery, sand excavation, agricultural runoff) of the map in figure 1. - please indicate for all tables and figures the sample size for the statistics, because this is important to interpret the results. - from the data I get the impression that SP-1 is the most polluted location (e.g. high Pd and Zn, lowest DO etc). Is there a specific explanation for that? Is the sand excavation close there or the brewery? This would also help to target your final conclusion how to improve the water quality. 6. Overall the amount of references is good, but a little low in the introduction, here some statements are done without an scientific reference. I included the manuscript with in red possible locations for additional references.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes the English writing is good.	
Optional/General comments	In line 176 in the discussion the author(s) state: Consumption of water with high TSS is harmful to the system. The word 'system' is very vague in this context, please specify.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Meindert Commelin**
Department, University & Country	**Wageningen University, Netherlands**