

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_125517
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Analysis of Water Sample from Njaba River and Borehole Water in Awo Mmama Imo State.</b>
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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is important to the scientific community because of its originality. It addressed the challenges being faced by the people in the study area. Also, it discusses new innovation.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is okay.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The different sections discussed in the manuscript are appropriate.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The description of the methodology is scientifically robust. It is also technically sound.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the references are recent and sufficient.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, the corrections noticed should be effected.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Titus Ogunseye</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Ibadan, Nigeria</b>