

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121848
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial-temporal variation in water quality parameters in South Coast estuarine ecosystem, Kenya
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>
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.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive assessment of water quality variation in Kenya's estuarine ecosystem, revealing the impacts of human activities and pollution. It offers insights for sustainable management and community engagement, making it a valuable contribution to the field, especially in light of rising environmental pressures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The article's title, "Spatial-temporal variation in water quality parameters in South Coast estuarine ecosystem, Kenya," is aptly chosen. It effectively communicates the study's main goal, which is to analyze changes in water quality within a particular ecosystem over time and geography.</p> <p>But if a different title is preferred, the following is a suggestion:</p> <p><u>"Assessing the Impact of Anthropogenic Activities on Water Quality in the South Coast Estuarine Ecosystem of Kenya: A Spatial-Temporal Analysis"</u></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 of the article is quite comprehensive, summarizing the key aspects of the study, including the objectives, methods, findings, and recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, providing a logical flow and clear presentation of the study's objectives, methods, results, and discussion.	
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.	The scientific rigor of this manuscript is clear from its meticulous methodology, rigorous statistical analysis, and thorough presentation of results. The study uses a carefully planned sampling approach across twelve stations, encompassing various hydrological conditions and anthropogenic influences. By employing sophisticated statistical techniques like ANOVA and PCA, the research ensures a comprehensive exploration of spatial and temporal changes in water quality parameters. Furthermore, the manuscript offers an in-depth discussion of its findings, connecting them to the study's objectives and the broader field of estuarine ecology. The technical soundness is further validated by the study's actionable recommendations for managing the ecosystem, showcasing its practicality and relevance to real-world environmental issues.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and cover a range of topics relevant to estuarine ecosystems, water quality, and anthropogenic impacts.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article with a Grammarly score of 77 are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-structured, with clear and concise language that effectively conveys the study's objectives, methods, results, and discussion.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>To further enhance the robustness of the study, the authors may consider incorporating the SIGNAL score as an additional method for assessing water quality. This approach would provide a more holistic view of the ecosystem's health by considering a broader range of parameters, including sediment, inorganic matter, greenery, nutrients, acidity, and aquatic life. The SIGNAL score could serve as a valuable tool for comparative analysis and for informing policy and management decisions, thereby contributing to the sustainable management of the South Coast estuarine ecosystem in Kenya."</p> <p>By suggesting the SIGNAL score as an optional comment, the reviewer would like to provide constructive feedback that could strengthen the study's methodology and overall impact.</p> <p>The manuscript is of good quality but requires minor revisions before it can be accepted for publication. The study is well-structured, with a clear methodology and robust statistical analysis. The results are comprehensive, and the discussion provides valuable insights into the spatial-temporal variation of water quality in the South Coast estuarine ecosystem.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Aditya Muktan Tamang</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sikkim Alpine University, India</p>