

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123799
Title of the Manuscript:	Monitoring and Assessment of Subarnarekha River Water Quality Using Water Quality Index
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript contributes to the scientific community by providing valuable data on the water quality of the Subarnarekha River, which is important for environmental monitoring and management. 2. The use of the Water Quality Index (WQI) makes the findings accessible and applicable for decision-makers in water resource management. 3. The study assesses multiple water quality parameters, providing a comprehensive view of the river's health. 4. While the manuscript is well-structured, it could benefit from a deeper discussion on the ecological and anthropogenic factors affecting water quality. 5. Overall, the research addresses a critical environmental issue, making it relevant and useful for the scientific community. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is clear and directly reflects the content of the study. However, a more detailed title could increase specificity. For example, adding geographic or time-related context might improve clarity, e.g., "Longitudinal Monitoring and Assessment of the Subarnarekha River Water Quality in 2023 Using Water Quality Index."</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>Comprehensive Nature: The abstract provides a general overview of the study, but it could benefit from a more detailed breakdown of the methodology, key results, and the implications of the findings. It's essential to provide more information on the sampling methodology, key parameters assessed, and the broader significance of the findings.</p> <p>Suggestions: Add key results (e.g., critical findings related to water quality) and how the study contributes to environmental monitoring efforts in the region.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections: The manuscript is generally well-structured, with clear subsections. However, the organization of the methods and results sections can be improved by clearly differentiating between different water quality parameters and highlighting key comparisons or trends over time.</p> <p>Flow: Ensure that the subsections flow logically, particularly when explaining the methodology followed by the analysis and discussion of results.</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>	<p>Scientific Robustness: The study is scientifically robust, relying on the Water Quality Index (WQI) methodology, which is a well-established tool for water quality assessment. The analysis of multiple parameters (such as pH, dissolved oxygen, etc.) adds to the study's credibility.</p> <p>Soundness: The manuscript is technically sound, but further clarification on the statistical methods used would improve the rigor. Specifically, explaining the rationale behind parameter selection and any potential limitations of the methods used would enhance transparency.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Adequacy: The references used in the manuscript appear adequate, though it is recommended to incorporate more recent studies, particularly those published in the last five years, to ensure the study is framed within the latest environmental and water quality research.</p> <p>Suggestions: Include recent studies on river water quality assessment using WQI, particularly in similar geographical regions, to strengthen the discussion and context of the findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English Quality: The language is generally clear and comprehensible, though there are occasional grammatical issues that should be addressed to enhance readability. Polishing the text for academic clarity, particularly in the discussion section, would improve the manuscript. Suggestions: Revise some of the longer sentences for better clarity, and ensure consistent use of scientific terms throughout.	
Optional/General comments	Strengths: The study addresses an important environmental issue—water quality monitoring. The use of WQI makes the research accessible and applicable for policy-making in water resource management. Weaknesses: The study could benefit from more detailed data on temporal changes or fluctuations in water quality. Additionally, a deeper discussion on potential anthropogenic influences on the water quality could provide a more thorough environmental assessment.	

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:	Ravikant Singh
Department, University & Country	Swami Vivekanand University, India