

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_126239
Title of the Manuscript:	Uncovering the Anthropogenic Influences on Water Quality: A Case of Lake Victoria Shores, Entebbe, Uganda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of anthropogenic activities on water quality, particularly regarding heavy metal contamination in Lake Victoria. The study addresses a critical issue for environmental science by examining how human activities degrade water quality, a concern directly affecting both biodiversity and public health in this region. It contributes significantly to the literature on freshwater ecosystems, water pollution, and the need for regulatory measures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the study's focus on examining anthropogenic influences on Lake Victoria's water quality. It is concise and informative.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, covering the objectives, methodology, and findings effectively, successfully covering the practical importance of the study without excess detail. No additional revisions are needed in this section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined sections that enhance readability and logical flow. The division into background, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion sections is appropriate for a research paper in this field.	
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.	This study demonstrates scientific rigor, particularly through its experimental design and the use of validated analytical methods, such as ICP-MS for heavy metal analysis. The combination of cross-sectional and experimental approaches strengthens the findings by providing quantitative and qualitative data. The manuscript is scientifically robust, using well-established methods to assess water quality, and it provides a solid foundation for future research on pollution mitigation. The results are supported by statistical data and are presented clearly, using tables for better interpretation. Additionally, comparisons with WHO standards and the analysis of community perceptions contribute to the validity of the conclusions, highlighting the correlation between anthropogenic activities and water quality in the Lake Victoria area.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are current and relevant, with an appropriate mix of recent studies and foundational research on water quality and pollution. The final bibliography contains most of the sources cited in the text; however, a detailed review reveals a few minor discrepancies. Some works in the reference list do not appear to be mentioned in the main text, while certain citations in the text may be missing from the bibliography. It is recommended to conduct a careful review to ensure complete consistency between the in-text citations and the final bibliography, so that each cited source is included in the bibliography and each entry in the bibliography is reflected in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for academic publication. Minor improvements to enhance clarity, particularly in the methodology section, would increase readability.	
Optional/General comments	Including a brief recommendation for policy changes or regulatory actions in the conclusion would strengthen the manuscript by highlighting practical applications of the research.	

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:	Angelica Dobre
Department, University & Country	Romani