

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_121867
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF WATER QUALITY INDEX (WQI) FROM SELECTED WATER BODIES IN DIFFERENT REGIONS OF SOUTHEAST NIGERIA
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 <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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper presents a usual study on the comparative analysis of water quality index by standard data analysis techniques. As such there is no novelty. My comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. There is no Clarity and Precision of Result in the abstract. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study and lists a range of physico-chemical parameters measured in the water samples. However, it could benefit from more clarity and precision in presenting these results. Specifically, the ranges for each parameter could be presented in a more structured manner, Additionally, the abstract mentions that the Pearson's Correlation Moment was performed and found statistically significant, but it does not explain which specific parameters were correlated and what the implications of these correlations are for water quality.</p> <p>2. Introduction section need to be modified and add more relevant studies The authors are advised to refer few Journal.</p> <p>DOI: 10.1007/s10661-023-11294-7 DOI: 10.1007/s10653-023-01822-2 DOI: 10.33472/AFJBS.6.9.2024.2773-2783</p> <p>3. Replace Ph with pH throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Could you give a more detailed explanation of the criteria used to select the parameters in your methodology and explain why certain parameters were left out?</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Aftab Alam</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>India</p>