



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_43423
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Potential Corrosivity of Borehole Waters in Eket, Nigeria by Saturation Index Measurement
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:

(<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 manuscript achieves the purpose defined in the abstract, but it is not well structured, it is not written with care, it is scientifically robust and technically sound. I'm convinced that the research is not innovative, but the study allows to increase the knowledge in the field of the borehole waters in Eket, Nigeria. Therefore, I believe that the manuscript can be accepted for publication after the following MAJOR REVISIONS. The manuscript has numerous punctuation errors. For example: Line 169. Replace "westward (.Akankpo" with "westward (Akankpo". Line 184. Replace "Ofonmbuk street(S2)" with "Ofonmbuk street (S2)". Line 190. Replace "500ml" with "500 mL". Etc. In my opinion, the Figure 4 is superfluous since the values (of A, B, C, D and pHs) are essentially constant and they are shown in the table 2. The manuscript must be corrected by a native English speaker (this is mandatory). The authors must include the figure 1 in the manuscript (Figure 1 is mentioned at line 164). The authors reported the "redox potential" both in figure 2 and in table 1. However, the authors do not comment on the values of this parameter in the "Experimental results" section. The authors reported the "DO" both in figure 2 and in table 1. However, the authors do not	Ok Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	comment on the values of this parameter in the "Experimental results" section. Table 3. Replace "PHs" with "pHs". Figure 3. Replace "Temperature (o C)" with "Temperature (°C)". Line 25. Replace "1.0 Introduction" with "1. Introduction". Line 147. Replace "2004)" with "2004).". Lines 157-158. The authors write "60°F to 140°F. Above 140°F, the rate of corrosion doubles for every 20°F". Can the authors indicate temperature values in degrees Celsius? Line 160. Replace "2.0 The Study Area" with "2. The Study Area". Line 182. Replace "3.0 Materials and Methods" with "3. Materials and Methods". Line 232. Replace "4.0 Results and Discussion" with "4. Results and Discussion". Line 290. Replace "5.0 Conclusion and Recommendation" with "5. Conclusion and Recommendation". Line 435. Replace "Fig.4" with "Fig. 4". Line 170. Replace "1991).. The landscape" with "1991). The landscape". Line 195. Replace "422.7nm" with "422.7 nm". Line 217. Replace "$pH_s = PK_2 - PK_s + p[Ca^{2+}] p[HCO_3^-] + 5pfm$" with "$pH_s = pK_2 - pK_s + p[Ca^{2+}] p[HCO_3^-] + 5pfm$". Line 222. Replace "[HCO₃]" with "[HCO₃⁻]". Line 234. Replace "Figures 2, 3, 3, 4 and 5" with "Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5". Line 415. Replace "Table1" with "Table 1".	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 418. Replace “Table2” with “Table 2”. Line 422. Replace “Table3” with “Table 3”. Throughout the manuscript. Replace “mg/l” with “mg/L”. Throughout the manuscript. Replace “Redox potential (mv)” with “Redox potential (mV)”. Throughout the manuscript. Replace “mg/litre” with “mg/L”.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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