



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_51104
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of physiochemical parameters of ground water: A case study
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	<p>General Revision Introduction is too long, please shortened at least one page.</p> <p>Individual Line 1, please delete because this is a case study article.</p> <p>Line 10 EC and TDS are in full spellings.</p> <p>Lines 20 to 39 are deleted because these contents are not related your article.</p> <p>Line 58 citation of ---polluted water.</p> <p>Line 78 Did you confirm that several parameters did not change during storage at 4 oC?</p> <p>Line 118 (, TDS,----) to (TDS-----).</p> <p>Line 119 According to (Table 2)--- to According to Table 2----.</p>	<p>Changes were made, and problems are mentioned in text.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

- Comment [Wc1]: Done
- Comment [Wc2]: Done
- Comment [Wc3]: It was already abbreviated, but now I change it with text.
- Comment [Wc4]: Did not Understand
- Comment [Wc5]: Agency information was cited.
- Comment [Wc6]: Yes, It was not changed, because as earlier it was sent for analysis.
- Comment [Wc7]: Did not Understand
- Comment [Wc8]: Did not Understand

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>	No ethical issue is present in this article