

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_121758
Title of the Manuscript:	Winkler Titration Assessment Of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD5) In Oka River, Toru-Orua, Bayelsa State
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)
<p>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>	<p>The article reflects the analysis of BOD for Oka River and it seems to be a short communication article to highlight the condition of the river in terms of fishing festive celebration. However, the manuscript needs to be revised and should be reviewed by an English expert to improve the quality of the manuscript in terms of language. Editors are suggested to use an AI detection tool to verify the disclaimer provided by the authors.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, title is suitable</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Needs revision</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology should include some figures related to sample collection and analysis. • The author should highlight why 1.8 and 2.5 ft depths were considered to collect the samples. • Samples L1 and L3 were collected at 8:00 am which is the time when we have sunrise but the author describes the sunset. • Why Ppm was considered to calculate the dissolved oxygen and BOD? Why not mg/L? • Results and discussion are too short for a paper. • Some comparisons between standard values should be highlighted and discussed in the result and discussion session. • Graphical representation should be provided to highlight the result. • What season was considered to perform the study? Since the festive was in February. Whether this study was performed before the festive or after the festive. • Conclusion contains repetition of result and discussion. The conclusion should only highlight the outcomes of the study in brief. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are okay, latest references should be added</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, seems suitable	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Syed Feroz Shah
Department, University & Country	Mehran University of Engineering and Technology, Pakistan