

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_116405
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Distribution of the Water Quality for Surface and Ground Water at Bonny Island, Nigeria
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1: Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The manuscript presents a timely and relevant investigation into the spatial distribution of water quality in Bonny Island, Nigeria, in relation to the local oil and gas industry.</p> <p>2 : It is suitable at some extent I will suggest "Assessment of the Spatial Distribution of Water Quality for Surface and Groundwater at Bonny Island, Nigeria"</p> <p>3: Yes, I find the abstract to be well-structured and informative, providing a clear overview of the study objectives, methodology, and findings. I commend the authors on their research efforts and the clarity of the abstract. However, I would suggest providing more specific details on the methods employed for data analysis, as well as any limitations or uncertainties associated with the study findings, to enhance the transparency and rigor of the research. Also, it would be beneficial to mention any potential implications of the findings for policy-making, regulatory enforcement, or future research directions in the abstract, to highlight the broader significance of the study outcomes.</p> <p>4 : The numbering of subsections appears to be incorrect. For clarity and consistency, it's important to ensure that the subsections are numbered sequentially according to the hierarchy of the document structure. (Recheck 2.3) I suggest reviewing the document's formatting and renumbering the subsections accordingly. Double-check the order and alignment of the subsection numbers to ensure they align with the overall organization of the content. Mention Equation no. properly. (like eq.1 or so)</p> <p>5 : Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6 : The literature review section appears to be weak and would benefit from a more comprehensive review of relevant literature, particularly incorporating recent studies and findings. I recommend expanding the literature review to include recent research articles, reports, and scholarly publications relevant to the study topic. Consider incorporating key findings, theories, methodologies, and discussions from recent literature to strengthen the theoretical framework and contextualize the study within the current academic discourse.</p> <p>Additional Suggestion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings of the study regarding the spatial distribution of water quality in Bonny Island, Nigeria, and highlights the significant impact of the oil and gas industry on water resources. However, it would benefit from further elaboration on the implications of these findings and recommendations for future actions. I recommend expanding the conclusion to discuss potential interventions and strategies for mitigating water contamination in the affected areas. Consider discussing specific measures that could be implemented by local authorities, regulatory agencies, and industry stakeholders to improve water quality and safeguard public health. Additionally, provide insights into the broader implications of the study findings for environmental management, policy-making, and community health in regions with similar industrial activities. Furthermore, consider discussing the limitations of the study, such as potential sources of bias or uncertainties, and areas for future research to address knowledge gaps and build upon the current findings. Providing a more comprehensive and forward-looking conclusion will enhance the relevance and impact of the study within the academic and policy communities.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>With minor revisions for consistency and clarity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Sudha Sippi
Department, University & Country	Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Technical University, Harcourt Butler Technological University, India