



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_46125
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF SURFACE AND GROUND WATER OF HONG LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	The title for Figures 1& 2 should be below each of the maps separately.	All the corrections were effected
Minor REVISION comments	Line1 should read 'The quality of water from surface and ground water sources in -----was studied to determine their suitability or otherwise for drinking or domestic purposes'. Line 2 should read 'Nine (9) samples, three (3) each from streams, dugwells and boreholes were randomly collected during the dry season' Line 3: the samples were analysed, and the values compared with WHO and NAFDAC standards to ascertain their compliance' Line 8: for boreholes, dug wells and boreholes. Sample collection: should read 'Three (3) samples each, from dug wells, streams and boreholes, were randomly collected' Determination of heavy metals: Magnesium, calcium and heavy metals (Cd, Pb, Zn, Fe, and Cu) concentrations were determined using AAS.	All the corrections were effected
Optional/General comments	Tables 1&2, 3&4, and 5&6 should be merged. Charts should be used for better illustration and comparison of data.	If the tables are merged the figures will be too tiny to read. The authors preferred using tables so as to give clearer comparison of the data and the values of the standards used

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)	