

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130000
Title of the Manuscript:	Groundwater Quality Assessment for Irrigation in Durg District, Chhattisgarh: A Hydro Geochemical Study
Type of the 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>

#### **PART 1: 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. 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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript looks very short.</li> <li>2. The introduction provides a solid foundation in terms of explaining water quality issues. However, the explanation and their characteristics could benefit from more clarification, especially regarding the difference between the relevant studies, related to the domain of the paper. Providing a brief on methods used, deterioration of water quality, required studies where it was conducted or applied or application scenario could enhance the reader's understanding of when each type is used in real-world systems.</li> <li>3. The objective is not clear. Write it as points.</li> <li>4. The methods used are normal, and hence should supported with selected studies, where it has been conducted.</li> <li>5. The results were not written correctly. However, the discussion of parameters should be done again, as it lacks the pace and correctness.</li> <li>6. Definition of observed datasets, methods used, should be more expanded.</li> <li>7. Authors are strongly recommended to enhance literature review.</li> <li>8. Lack of any convincing discussion: accuracy metrics/solid comparative analysis with other scholars' approaches/visualized results in compare with others/physical interpretation/uncertainty quantification.</li> <li>9. Limitations, Recommendations, and Future scope should be added.</li> <li>10. A graphical abstract should be added, and a flow chart also.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Abhijeet Das</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>C.V. Raman Global University (CGU), India</b></p>