

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_79051
Title of the Manuscript:	An Appraisal of borehole Water Quality Index in Selected Areas within Owerri Metropolis, Imo State, Southeastern Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Research article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In one hand, it is said that water with TDS value less than 500mg/L is said to be good and on the other hand, water with TDS greater than 250mg/L is considered not good. Justify the statement.</li> <li>2. In the paper, you have mentioned that the cations present in the water are extremely less as a result, TDS and EC are also less. Justify how they are extremely less in the groundwater.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change mg/l to mg/L</li> <li>2. In the second sentence of the Introduction, either sentence is incomplete or the percentage value of water is wrong because total percentage does not meet 100%. Check it carefully.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would be better if you have shown the calculation of quality rating (<math>q_n</math>) and K for the evaluation of WQI.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arun Kumar Shrestha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Damak Multiple Campus, Nepal</b>