



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_52870
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Leachate from a Dumpsite on Groundwater Quality
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>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. A fair effort by the author(s) who have carried out in-depth analysis of the adverse impacts of un-regulated solid waste management practices on ground water resources , local ecosystem and on to biodiversity. The research paper contains , both substance and material pertaining to heavy metals only . Following comments are made ;</p> <p>a. I have slightly modified the study theme , as the theme lacked adverse impacts of leachate seepage on local ecosystem and on biodiversity. This additional information must be included in t he study to make this study more informative , scientific conclusive . (Please check my remarks on the attached manuscript)</p> <p>b. Author(s) have not followed the standard research paper format which is important for chronological writing of research contents . I have corrected the same , . (Please check my remarks on the attached manuscript)</p> <p>c. Study objectives have been missed out and the readers will get confuse without knowing the objectives for writing this paper . I have marked the same on the attached manuscript in track change format</p> <p>d. Likewise , literature review and specially recommendations part . please see my comments on the attached manuscript . The same has been indicated in the form of comments - in track change ( see the attached manuscript )</p> <p>e. Recommendations No precise set of recommendations was included , which should now be included . I have suggested the draft set of recommendations , . (Please check my remarks on the attached manuscript)</p> <p>e. All deletions &amp; additions have been highlighted with red and blue colours respectively ( pl see attached marked manuscript )</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Introduction has been mixed up with literature review, therefore, some of the material is recommended to be shifted under literature review paragraph. please see the comments on the attached manuscript	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	These are OK, Preferably , reference sitting should be on the line of APA format. DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs should be added	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Islam-ul-Haque</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pakistan</b>