

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125129
Title of the Manuscript:	Delineation of groundwater quality assessment in Salem District, Tamil Nadu.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Article Title: Assessing Groundwater Potentiality and Water Poverty: A Case Study of Bandu Watershed, Purulia, West Bengal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This study presents and focuses on Delineation of groundwater quality assessment in Salem District, Tamil Nadu. The article has the potential to be published in the journal, but not in its present form. The introduction requires refinements, and the methodology is poorly written. Many sentences in the manuscript are unclear, and the figures and tables need to be reformulated. Additionally, the results require significant improvements. Therefore, I would recommend it for major revision.</p> <p>Comment 1: The abstract doesn't show the accurate content and the main findings of the study area. Please add the main findings of the research work.</p> <p>Comment 2: Quantitative results should be provided in the abstract to make it more comprehensive. The results of the model should be added in the abstract section. Also, The main aim of the study should be clearly mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>Comments 3: I recommend the authors to write in the Introduction more explicitly based on existing literature, what is missing in previous studies, and what is the added value of this new study.</p> <p>Comment 4: A comprehensive literature is required for identifying the research gaps and highlights.</p> <p>Comments 5: The method section is too simple and lacks of innovation and scientific contribution. Please elaborate the steps in method.</p> <p>Comments 6: A good and interactive methodological flow chart is needed for understanding the whole framework. The methodological flow chart is not up to the mark.</p> <p>Comments 7: The writing of the result section is cumbersome. Please rewrite it to the point.</p> <p>Comment 8: Please proofread the article carefully; the manuscript has many linguistic errors. The manuscript's English need to be significantly improved.</p> <p>Comment 9: Many articles have been published in similar research areas in the last 3-5 years in the same journal. Please refer to it in this manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-4745-2018</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-04403-6</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-8-377-2014</p> <p>Comment 10: Novelty and research organization should be deeply discussed.</p> <p>Comment 11: The applications of the study should be highlighted at the end of the Discussion.</p> <p>Comments 12: Please add more discussion material. What were perhaps different results from other studies and why?</p> <p>Comments 13: The conclusion should be specific. It is recommended to just highlight the key findings of the work. The section Research gaps and future scope should be specific, not in a general form.</p> <p>The article can be published in the journal but not in the present form. The introduction needs refinements. The methodology is poorly written. Many sentences are unclear in the manuscript. Figures and Tables need to be re-formulated. The discussion section needs a lot of improvements. Therefore, I would recommend it for major revision.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anoop Kumar Shukla
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology, India