

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Geological Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_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	manuscript

#### 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.	<p>1- The importance of this manuscript to the scientific community is due to its comprehensive analysis of water starting from the water source and passing through the treatment stages in the station until adding chlorine to the water to identify weak points and determine appropriate interventions to improve water quality.</p> <p>2- The population must be emphasized and made aware not to use river and reservoir water without treatment due to the high bacterial load in it.</p> <p>3- It is preferable to increase the number of samples and withdraw them at different times to evaluate the water more accurately according to the seven points mentioned</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p><b>The time of assessment should be added to the title:</b>            Quality assessment of raw and treated water and efficiency of the water treatment plant coupled with Dunumadalawa reservoir (<u>study period</u>) in Kandy, Sri Lanka</p>	
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 lacks clarification of the sampling period, frequency, and examination methods used in brief	
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.	In my opinion, this manuscript needs to be strengthened by adding more samples from the same sites. I do not think it is correct to evaluate the water quality at the seven sites by collecting three samples from each of the seven sites at once, but rather this should be repeated at different times and days so that we can judge the quality of the treatment. Also, please add the status of the water samples from the same places before the development and enhancement of the plant so that it is clear how efficient the updates made to the plant are	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<p>Need to add more recent references and replace the old references with new references            As the following;            WHO (World Health Organization). Guidelines for drinking water quality, 4th ed.  <u>2022 instead of 2011.</u></p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mona Ezzat Abd El Tawab
Department, University & Country	Egypt