



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_35588
Title of the Manuscript:	DWINDLING WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS: A SURVEY OF IMPACTS OF ANTHROPOGENIC ACTIVITY ON MARURA WETLAND, KENYA
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>)



SDI 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	From the limnological point of view, the study presents a diagnosis of the water quality of the Marura swamp. Once it represents a region of great ecological importance - a wetland - the knowledge of the environmental quality status is important for development of national policies on wetlands conservation and management. Overall, the structure of the manuscript seems like a scientific report and requires that information be summarized to represent a scientific article. The whole discussion needs to be improved. In abstract: "This study investigated effect of multiple point source pollution on the physicochemical environment of the wetland": This is not exactly the purpose of the study. How to identify the multiple point of pollution source? The real objective was to monitor the water quality (using some limnological variables) from different sampling points of a swamp during the flood and drought period. Lines 31-35 is not the conclusion of the study. It is just a recommendation and this results-based approach needs to be better explored in the discussion of the data from the limnological monitoring. Please check redundancy in information all over the manuscript. For example: Line 46 and 78 gives the same information about precipitation 2000 mm. Line 44 to 60 in Introduction must be referenced; much information is not properly cited. Figure 1 is distorted. Line 87: Statement of the problem must be moved to the Introduction section. Line 123: Why were only these variables selected? Based on what anthropogenic activities? If the colonial government (1958-1961) recommended the conservation of the swamp to absorb tons of heavy metals why metals was not analyzed?	-I agree -Indeed it is a scientific report and discussion has been improved -Statement rephrased as advised -Conclusion has been reworked on as recommended (See compared document) -Redundant information checked and deleted -More citations added -Statement of the problem merged with introduction -Variables were selected depending on anthropogenic activities. This phrase has been added. -Quantification of metals can be expressed in terms of conductivity and one of the variables is conductivity that covered for metals. A future study could be conducted on identification of the heavy metals that are present in the waters of Marura Wetland



SDI Review Form 1.6

	From Line 128 to 220: The description of the calibration of the equipment is not suitable for a scientific article (but for a scientific report). The analytical methods employed can be inserted into a table and referenced according to the literature. Line 260: BOD₅? This analysis was not performed. Results: Considering that there were differences between the hydrological periods (rain and dry), the results should be summarized statistically indicating these differences between the sampling points and the limnological variables. These differences were the main point of the manuscript. The manuscript shows an excess of tables. Please summarize. What does KNWQS for drinking water means? If it is the same as WHO, why both categories were listed in Table 12? Line 398: What this statement means? "It was established that water temperature was corresponding the air temperature". It really has correspondence, but the absolute values are not the same. How to prove this statement: "This can therefore be attributed to multiple source pollution from adjacent farms and industrial wastes that find their way to contaminate the waters of Marura Wetland" Water temperature is often related with climate! Line 412: pH is also related to soil characteristics. Line 414: Phytoremediation? Line 424: Typha sp prefer saline conditions. What it means? Line 434 to 437: This argument is disconnected from the discussion. Line 459: Again: phytoremediation? What it means in the discussion? Line 478: "Presence of phosphates in water indicates the possibility of algal blooms which can cause death of aquatic animals". The eutrophication problem must be better discussed in the manuscript. The discussion must be deeply improved, more information about the limnological variables must be introduced and related with the data obtained. Discussion on how the diagnosis of water quality can assist in conservation policies should also be added in the discussion.	- The analytical methods employed have been inserted into a table (Table 1B) and referenced according to the literature. -Agreed that analysis was not performed. The term BOD₅ has been deleted (See compared document) -The results indicate differences between wet and dry seasons. Both the ANOVA tables and the figures. - Kenya National Water Quality Standards (K-NWQS). Acronym has been defined(See compared document) -It has been attributed to multiple source pollution from adjacent farms and industrial wastes that find their way to contaminate the waters of Marura Wetland as well as climatic conditions. I have as well referenced to findings of previous studies (See compared document) -Addressed (included in text) (See compared document) -Term deleted (See compared document) -The argument expunged (See compared document) - This argument is disconnected was deleted and replaced -Term replaced (See compared document) -Possibility of algal blooms indicated -Data obtained has been used in discussion and compared with findings from other studies as referenced.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion should be reworked based on the proposed objectives. In the way it is, is vague and unfounded with the results obtained.	-Conclusion has been reworked on as recommended (See compared document)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		