

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1793
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Groundwater Quality Monitoring Network Using Cluster Analysis, Shib-Kuh Plain, Shur Watershed, Iran
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Study is relevant and important for having planned nd optimized groundwater quality observation network to reduce the multiple random observations, if it could be relised and done practically for having representative monitoring well with respect to variables based on premonsoon, postmonsoon and annual basis. Further inferences can be also derived why the spatio-temporal variation in quality variables are taking place.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I prefer to be: Groundwater Quality Monitoring Network Optimisation using Cluster Analysis for Shib-Kuh Plain within Shur Watershed of Iran	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	First two sentences may be replced by the following proposed sentence: 'The groundwater quality observation site has not been designed adequetly to represent the area specific properties and variations resulting in large or small number of sites and monitoring problems.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Manuscript looks brief and indicative only	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Mentioning monitoring well, but need to write open well or tubewell. Mentioned study area of alluvial plain and unconfined aqufer. Water level annual variation as 10 to 40 m below GL. Hence open well is Ok in unconfined alluvial but so much deep maynot be feasible. Then certainly it is tubewell. But need to be confirmed that how the tubewlls, also considered, of agriculture water supply are functioning without water at Piezometric head (tapping confined aquifer)? There is a stream crossing, How its impact or quality of recharge zone have been been taken in account?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	NA	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript should be checked running gramerly	
Optional/General comments	20 out of 100 wells for 8 years and 450 samples, means in average 3 observations per well per year. 1. A cross table should had been given showing no. of observation in pre monsoon and post monsoon corresponding to each well (W1...W20) and each year (2005....2012) 2. Table of Finalized representative well out of analysed wells suitable for quality variables in pre & post seasons and annual basis. 3. If possible the aversge water quality variables (all) and water table of analysed wells in pre and post monsoon and annual basis. 4. Define legend for relevancy of colours used in figures (2 to 5)	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anand Verdhen
Department, University & Country	India