

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-51892

Date: 28/5/2025

**Title:** A STUDY ON THE VARIATION OF WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS ACROSS DIVERSE WATER SAMPLES

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....  
 Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....√.....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: Ahmed M. Saqr

**Date:** 28/5/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

This manuscript offers valuable baseline data on water quality from major sources in Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, by systematically analyzing odour, turbidity, pH, and hardness. Its comparative approach across dams and a river provides important local insights into the challenges of water use for drinking and agriculture. The clear presentation of findings highlights both public health implications and the need for regular monitoring, serving as a useful reference for future regional water quality assessments.

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

*Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled "A Study on the Variation of Water Quality Parameters Across Diverse Water Samples", submitted to the International Journal of Applied Research. I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation and improvement of this work. The manuscript addresses an important public health and environmental topic, analyzing fundamental water quality parameters across multiple sources in Rajasthan. The structure is clear and the language accessible; however, the present draft suffers from several methodological and scientific gaps, lack of analytical depth, and insufficient contextualization in the current literature.*

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

*Substantial revision is required to bring the paper to the expected standard for publication in IJAR.*

*Below, I provide detailed major and minor comments, organized by manuscript sections, to help the authors strengthen their research and address current shortcomings.*

### *Major Comments*

#### *1. Abstract*

- Could the authors quantify the results in the abstract? For instance, what were the ranges or mean values of the measured parameters? Currently, the abstract is mainly descriptive and lacks numerical findings, which are important for clarity and impact.*

#### *2. Introduction*

- The introduction is broad but could the authors better articulate the novelty of this work relative to existing water quality studies in this region? What specific knowledge gap does this study fill in the context of Rajasthan or the sampled locations?*

#### *3. Literature Review*

- While several studies are cited, the literature review lacks a clear critical analysis. Can the authors explicitly compare their approach, sampling, or findings to those of past studies? What methodologies or results in the cited literature most directly inform or contrast with the current work?*

#### *4. Methodology*

- The methods section mentions standard protocols, but can the authors specify the exact analytical standards or guideline documents followed for each test (e.g., APHA method numbers)? How were sensory evaluations standardized to minimize bias?*
- How was sample size determined, and how many replicates were taken per site? Could the authors discuss the representativeness and reliability of their sampling approach?*

#### *5. Results – Data Presentation*

- The results are presented mostly in qualitative or tabular form. Can additional quantitative data (e.g., summary statistics, error margins, standard deviations) be provided for each parameter across sites? Additionally, are there any statistical comparisons among sites (e.g., ANOVA, t-tests) to support claims of variation?*

#### *6. Results – Figures and Images*

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- *The manuscript uses Google Maps screenshots as figures. Are the figures clear, appropriately labelled, and of publication-quality resolution? Could the authors provide original maps or graphical representations (e.g., bar graphs, boxplots of results), rather than screenshots, to summarize spatial and parameter variations more effectively?*

### 7. Discussion

- *The discussion section could be more analytical. For instance, how do the extremely high hardness readings compare to other studies in similar arid or semi-arid regions? What are the most likely sources of such extreme values, and what seasonal or anthropogenic factors could play a role? Is there a mechanistic explanation for the observed results?*

### 8. Conclusion

- *The conclusions currently summarize results but do not offer actionable recommendations or identify priorities for policy or further research. Can the authors add specific, evidence-based recommendations for local authorities or farmers, and outline directions for future work?*

### 9. References

- *Several web-based resources (e.g., Google Maps) are listed as references. Are all references directly cited in the text, and are they formatted consistently according to the journal's style? Can the authors expand primary literature citations, especially for recent water quality studies in India?*
- 

## Minor Comments

### 1. Abstract

- *There is a typographical error: "analysed" and compare" should be corrected to "analyze and compare".*

### 2. Introduction

- *The tone is very informal (e.g., "Without clean water, it is very difficult to live a healthy and comfortable life. "). Can this be rewritten in a more academic style?*

### 3. Literature Review

- *Section numbering is inconsistent and sometimes misapplied (e.g., usage of "1. Introduction" immediately after "LITERATURE REVIEW"). Please revise for clarity.*

### 4. Methodology

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- *The methods section has repetitive information regarding the study sites and wildlife sanctuary context. This could be condensed and clarified for focus.*  
5. Results
- *The interpretation statements in the results section ("Result: All four water samples had extremely high hardness levels...") could be merged with the Discussion to avoid redundancy.*  
6. Figures
- *Captions for all figures (e.g., Google Maps images) should adhere to the journal's formatting guidelines and include sufficient detail for standalone understanding.*  
7. Discussion
- *Please ensure all potential limitations, including the subjectivity of sensory odour assessments, are addressed explicitly in the discussion.*  
8. References
- *Reference styles are inconsistent (some entries list full URLs, others do not). Please standardize according to the journal's requirements.*