

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_85775
Title of the Manuscript:	CONCENTRATION LEVELS OF HEAVY METALS AND OTHER PARAMETERS IN WATER BOREHOLE AROUND MOGADISHU AREA, SOMALIA
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.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy>)

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	<u>Abstract</u> ...Quality water supply is one of the constraints being experienced in Mogadishu city and heavy metals content is of concern... this line should be expunged from the abstract After first mention, element symbols should be used to conserve space. <u>Results</u> Data presented in the results section is scanty for a publication <u>Conclusion</u> Conclusion is lengthy. It should be precise and go straight to the point on the findings form the present study <u>References</u> Author(s) did not follow a strict pattern in the reference section.	The abstract is corrected as per the reviewer's comment and some paragraphs are being expunged from the abstract section. Result. the Data was analysed just using excel which I believe is a friendly use tool for researchers, additionally, each parameter is analysed separately to make the information obtained is clear and understandable with thanks
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction section should be reviewed. Multiple tables and graphs could have been presented as one table. The information on Fig. 4 & table 2 is it what is presented in figure 5?	That was a typical error, and I rechecked the table numbering because there is no missing table in the manuscript. The whole manuscript is revised and checked well giving attention to the points that the Reviewers highlighted and hope this will be the final one with many thanks
Optional/General comments	The table under this caption...Recommended values in drinking water...please make it more explicit The entire work needs to be properly reviewed and rearranged especially the results.	The results of heavy metals and other parameters obtained were presented in table 3.1 and as a figure, they were split into three figures heavy metals, chemical ions like Fluoride, chloride, and nitrates, and the last group of pH, EC, TDS, and Hardness as you will see in the revised article

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)	No, Please