

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_125086
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality assessment of raw and treated water and efficiency of the water treatment plant coupled with Dunumadalawa reservoir in Kandy, Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	

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.	I think this manuscript is very important for the scientific community. The results obtained will guide users of water from the Dunumadalawa reservoir in Kandy, Sri Lanka on the safety of water from the dam for different uses. The results will also advise local/national health authorities on the health and safety of citizens of Sri Lanka.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title of the article is not very suitable. Consider using: "Assessment of the Raw and Treated Water Quality and Efficiency of the Water Treatment Plant at Dunumadalawa reservoir in Kandy, Sri Lanka".	
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 study was carried out to assess the quality of water at a specific location but no mention of the study area was made in the abstract. The phrase "... evaluate the efficiency of water treatment plants by assessing water samples before and after treatment and comparing results with ..." should be rephrased to, "... evaluate the efficiency of the water treatment plant at Dunumadalawa reservoir in Kandy, Sri Lanka, by assessing water samples from the dam before and after treatment and comparing results with ..."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. The sections and subsections should be numbered appropriately (2.0, 2.1, 2.2, etc.). 2. Discussion of the physicochemical parameters (meaning, causes, effects, permissible limits), which was done under the "Results and discussion" section should be moved to the "Introduction" section. Only results obtained from analysis should be discussed in the "Results and discussion" section.	
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.	1. The sampling method used in the research is acceptable. 2. The methods used for bacteriological analysis of water samples are described and are correct. 3. The methodology used for analysis of the physicochemical parameters should be outlined or, a suitable reference should be cited. 4. The water quality standards (SLS and WHO) used for comparison of all the parameters analyzed in this research, should be presented in a tabular form, as a part of the introduction section. 5. A summary of all results obtained vis-a-vis SLS/WHO standards should be presented in a table for ease of access. 6. The results of some key physicochemical parameters (fluoride, calcium, residual chlorine, etc.) are missing. 7. There was no analysis, result or discussion related to the evaluating the EFFICIENCY of the treatment plant. That key word will need to form part of the research or, be expunged from the title. 7.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	1. The references are not sufficient and most of them are not recent. Consider adding more relevant references from research published within ≤ 10 years. 2. Paragraph 2 of the introduction should have appropriate reference(s). The researcher(s) may search out other sections which need additional references and add them.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	1. The map of the study area should be included under the subsection, "Study Site". 2. The research article is similar to a previously published reasearch cited below. However, as water quality requires routine (annual) monitoring, it is not out of place to have another study done on the same study area after two years. Daulagala, P. W. H. K. P., L. D. K. Marasinghe, and Y. A. S. Samithri. 2021. "Analysis of Physicochemical and Bacteriological Parameters of Raw and Treated Water of Roseneath Water Purification Plant in Dunumadalawa Forest Reserve in Kandy, Sri Lanka". <i>Asian Journal of Research in Botany</i> 4 (2):370-78. https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/article/view/117 .	

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:	Chinyere Ogbodo
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria