

### 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.	The script has good significance. Groundwater quality is important for irrigation because it affects crop growth, soil health, and agricultural productivity. The irrigation quality indices are dependent on the concentration of dissolved ions in water, which play a key role in assessing their suitability for irrigation purposes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	General overall groundwater quality with respect to major physico -chemical parameters is needed .	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. However major corrections are needed prior to acceptance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Up to date literature is required.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript has significance in terms of irrigational suitability.. However corrections are required to strengthen the quality of the article.</li> <li>2. Previous Literature with respect to the study area is missing.</li> <li>3. Significance of the study is missing in the introduction. Authors could quote the global references, and recent literature wrt irrigational quality.</li> <li>4. Introduction seems to be very vague. Authors could quote the</li> <li>5. Geology, Geomorphology of the study area is missing.</li> <li>6. What does the spatial distribution maps indicate/. Write about its inference wherever figure is given.</li> <li>7. Is the Sampling year is 2013?</li> <li>8. Statistical data of the analysis is missing.</li> <li>9. What are the crops grown Inthe study area?</li> <li>10. Overall water quality wrt EC, TDS and other parameters has to be included.</li> <li>11. Sampling numbers are missing. Location map of sampling is missing.</li> <li>12. Precision and accuracy of methodology is missing.</li> <li>13. What are the standard methods for analysis/? References are missing.</li> <li>14. Ionic balances are missing.</li> <li>15. Statistical data of the irrigational quality parameters is also missing.</li> <li>16. Collecting samples from 10 locations seems to be erroneous. Justify..</li> <li>17. Any monsoonal variation in collecting the sample?</li> <li>18. Figure 5 is not clear.</li> <li>19. What does the spatial distribution maps suggest? Authors have to mention its inference. Otherwise drawing the diagrams seems to be no use.</li> <li>20. References were not at all up to date.</li> <li>21. Authors shall quote and go through these files for more information</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-021-01527-w">https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-021-01527-w</a></li> <li>2. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydrres.2019.11.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydrres.2019.11.008</a></li> <li>3. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-024-02229-3">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-024-02229-3</a>.</li> <li>4. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2024.143322">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2024.143322</a></li> </ol>	

**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>V.Sunitha</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>Yogi Vemana University, India</p>