



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_55682
Title of the Manuscript:	Geostatistical Modelling of Groundwater Quality at Rumuola Community, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
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	<p>The manuscript is too long. It is definitely necessary to improve and shorten the "Introduction" (5 pages is too much), delete the formula (1). Write clearly what the purpose of the presented article is.</p> <p>Correct the pH value in Figure 1 (see explanations to figure)</p> <p>Comparing Fig. 3 (Nickel Kriging) and Fig. 8 (Hardness Kriging), it can easily be seen that the distribution of both these parameters strongly differs from the remaining figures. This is due to the Kriging method used in data interpolation. Maybe another method would give a better distribution of these parameters? In the current figures, the distribution of changes of this parameter is not possible to explain.</p> <p>In "Conclusion" is: "<i>The best interpolation models for the groundwater quality parameters are as follows: EBK for pH, TDS, Sulphate and nitrate; Ordinary kriging for Nickel and Hardness; IDW for Iron and arsenic; Cokriging for WQI</i>". Looking at Figures 3 and 8, I'm not sure that Ordinary kriging for Nickel and Hardness is the best interpolation models for the groundwater quality parameters (see point upper).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Dorota Porowska</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Warsaw, Poland</i>