

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2718
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-Chemical Characteristic of Gorewada Lake Water in Nagpur, India
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a thorough assessment of the water quality of Gorewada Lake, a crucial water source in Nagpur, India. It highlights the growing concern of water contamination in urban lakes, offering insights into the environmental and public health risks posed by deteriorating water quality. The use of standard physico-chemical parameters makes it a valuable reference for similar studies worldwide. While the study is comprehensive in its data collection, it could be strengthened with deeper analysis and a focus on practical solutions, which would enhance its impact on environmental management practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " Physico-Chemical Characteristic of Gorewada Lake Water in Nagpur, India, " is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study, focusing on the analysis of physico-chemical parameters of the lake's water. However, for improved clarity and scientific appeal, a more specific title could be: " Assessment of Physico-Chemical Parameters and Water Quality of Gorewada Lake, Nagpur, India. " This alternative emphasizes both the parameters studied and the focus on water quality, which is the key outcome of the research.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a general overview of the study but lacks specific details that would make it more comprehensive. It identifies the importance of water quality monitoring and lists the physico-chemical parameters analyzed, but it does not clearly present the key findings or their implications. Additionally, the abstract could benefit from a more precise conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate but could benefit from several improvements to enhance clarity and organization. It follows a logical progression, beginning with an introduction and moving through the study area, methodology, results, and discussion. However, the methodology is embedded within the study area, making it less accessible. Creating a distinct "Materials and Methods" section would provide better clarity and help readers easily locate the research design. Additionally, separating the "Results and Discussion" sections would improve the flow by clearly distinguishing between data presentation and interpretation. This would allow for a more structured and in-depth analysis of the findings. The manuscript could also benefit from a more comprehensive "Conclusion" section that summarizes key findings, implications, and potential future directions. A separate "Recommendations" section discussing potential solutions or regulatory measures would also add practical value, especially given the water quality issues identified. These adjustments would make the manuscript more organized, easier to follow, and more aligned with scientific writing conventions.	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it adheres to established standards, such as APHA (1998), for water quality analysis. The use of multiple physico-chemical parameters—pH, dissolved oxygen, biochemical oxygen demand, and others—demonstrates a comprehensive approach to assessing water quality. Additionally, the correlation matrix provides insight into the relationships between various parameters, enhancing the depth of analysis. However, while the methodology is appropriate, the lack of details on sample site distribution and frequency could limit the study's overall reliability. Nonetheless, the overall scientific framework and analytical techniques applied are sound and well-aligned with environmental monitoring research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript provide a solid foundation, but many of them are somewhat outdated, with a significant number of sources from the late 1990s and early 2000s. While some of these older references are essential for foundational methods (such as APHA 1998), there is a noticeable absence of more recent studies or reviews, especially in the last decade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating more recent references, particularly studies from the last 5-10 years, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and ensure that the research reflects current advancements in water quality analysis and environmental monitoring. • It would be beneficial to include references on current trends in water contamination sources (e.g., microplastics, heavy metals) and modern water treatment or remediation technologies. This would provide a more contemporary context for the study. <p>By including more up-to-date literature, the manuscript will strengthen its scientific rigor and provide a broader and more current perspective on water quality management.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is understandable but needs improvement for scholarly communication. There are minor grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent punctuation. Revising these areas for clarity, grammar, and smoother sentence structure will enhance readability and make the manuscript more suitable for publication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Abhijit Pathak</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>BGC Trust University, Bangladesh</p>