

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_125517
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Water Sample from Njaba River and Borehole Water in Awo Mmama Imo State.
Type of the Article	Journal 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: 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.	The region has challenges of potable water supply due to population increase and anthropogenic inputs. The article is good for the audience but poorly presented. There is need for a proper scientific reporting and the number of samples was too small to draw conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NO Comparative Assessment of Ground and Surface Water Sources from Awo Mmama Community, Imo State	
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.	NO There is need to include; 1. Include the analytical methods 2. State some striking result figures 3. Sampling size and frequency 4. Notable Recommendation	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but the sections and sub-sections should be numbered eg 1.0 Introduction 2.0 Materials and Methods 3.0 Results 4.0 Discussions 5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations	
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.	This manuscript lack scientific correctness and not holistic in description and presentation. There are statistical analysis to show comparative analysis as supposed to.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO, more recent references be given especially 2019-2024	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	William Azuka lyama
Department, University & Country	Rivers State University, Nigeria