

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_126243
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Water Quality in Pangani, Kayole and Dandora Boreholes in Nairobi County, Kenya
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>

#### 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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a critical issue of water quality in Nairobi, an area facing water scarcity and contamination challenges. By assessing the physical, chemical, and bacteriological parameters of borehole water, it provides valuable data that can inform public health policies and water management strategies. The study's findings on heavy metal contamination and microbial presence highlight potential health risks, emphasizing the need for mitigation efforts. I appreciate the thorough methodology and detailed analysis presented, although the discussion could benefit from deeper exploration of contamination sources and implications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 but could be more concise. It should combine related points, highlight key findings (e.g., specific contaminants exceeding guidelines), and add a brief recommendation. This would make it clearer and more impactful.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness in several ways. Firstly, it adheres to established methodologies for water quality assessment, including the use of standard methods like ion-selective electrodes, atomic absorption spectrophotometry, and gravimetric methods for parameter determination (Ms_AJACR_126243). Furthermore, it compares the findings against established WHO guidelines, providing a credible benchmark for evaluating water quality (Ms_AJACR_126243). The study also presents clear data on multiple relevant parameters (physical, chemical, bacteriological), ensuring comprehensive coverage of potential contaminants (Ms_AJACR_126243). Finally, it discusses results critically by identifying areas where certain boreholes do not conform to safety standards, thereby contributing valuable insights for local water safety management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant but could benefit from more recent sources. Adding updated WHO guidelines (2017) and recent studies, such as the 2023 research on water quality in Iraq, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical improvements and sentence refinements would enhance clarity and flow.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Title and Abstract:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The title accurately reflects the study's content.</li> <li>○ The abstract effectively summarizes the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, it could be more concise, focusing on the key findings.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>2. Introduction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The introduction provides a good background on water quality issues and the importance of assessing borehole water in Nairobi.</li> <li>○ Consider including recent references to support statements about water scarcity and contamination, providing a more current context.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>3. Methodology:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The methodology is detailed and adequately describes the sampling, chemical analysis, and procedures used for the various tests.</li> <li>○ The section on equipment and chemicals could be shortened by omitting some details, like reagent preparation, which might not be necessary for a broad audience.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>4. Results and Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The results are clearly presented with appropriate tables and interpretations.</li> <li>○ It would be beneficial to provide more in-depth analysis of why certain parameters (e.g., heavy metals) exceeded WHO guidelines and discuss the potential health implications.</li> <li>○ Correlating the results with potential sources of contamination in the regions would add depth to the discussion.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>5. Figures and Tables:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The tables are well-organized and convey the data effectively. However, some figures (such as a map of the sampling locations) could be more detailed to aid understanding.</li> <li>○ Including graphical representations of key results (e.g., bar charts for heavy metal concentrations) might enhance the visual appeal.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>6. Conclusions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The conclusions are in line with the findings, but recommendations for improving water quality or further research should be more specific.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>7. References:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The reference list appears comprehensive but could be updated to include more recent studies on water quality in Kenya.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>8. Language and Style:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The language is generally clear, but some sections could be streamlined to avoid repetition (e.g., methodological details).</li> <li>○ Ensure consistency in terminology and units (e.g., mg/L vs. ppm).</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>In summary, the manuscript is well-structured and provides valuable insights into water quality in Nairobi. Enhancing the discussion and ensuring a concise presentation will improve its impact.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Mohammed Abdul Baset Abdul Jabar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Karkh University of Science, Iraq</b>