

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_89775
Title of the Manuscript:	Appraising the State of Knowledge of the Valuation of Contaminated Freshwater Ecosystem of the Niger Delta
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The framework of abstract doesn't fall into framework of a scientific paper. Abstract is missing sections such as type of study, name of research design, methodology, findings and conclusion.</p> <p>The frequent use of valuation, valuers... are wrong in the abstract. English must be rechecked seriously.</p> <p>There are some typographic errors in the text.</p> <p>What means [7] in the beginning of sentence? Or according to [11]. It is wrong you have to the author name. So recheck all similar mistakes.</p> <p>What means[13] citing Daka, Amakiri-Whyte, Inyang, (2014), Ogamba, Izah, Oribu, (2015), Ogamba, Seiyaboh, Izah, (2015), Seiyaboh, Inyang, Izah, (2016), and Seiyaboh, Izah, Oweibi, (2017)?</p> <p>Recheck grammar in the text.</p> <p>The text is too long because introduction chapter is too long. You have to remove redundant words out of objective followed by research.</p> <p>The word of "valuers" seems wrong.</p> <p>To present the existing data in the tables 2 and 4 you have to add their equations (any model or relationship) in the methodology chapter? How did you figure out them? The procedure of getting findings in both tables are very important. With simple percentages you cannot publish this paper at all. Both tables are strengthens points of your research. What means ranking in the table 4? You have to introduce them as criteria of your study and finalize them with ranking. Don't forget the objectives of your research.</p> <p>The content of table 3 seems incorrect? How did you figure the frequency out? Is it correct the values of 37 and 14? Recheck the column carefully according to values and participants.</p> <p>Once the appearance of abbreviated words in full detail is urgent. What means RESP 7? Recheck all similar words.</p> <p>The present paper is a good study in concept but author doesnot have enough knowledge to present data and writing a scientific article. The criteria selected by author accommodated in table 4 needs to be described relevantly.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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:	Malek Hassanpour
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India