

Paper: “A Review of Water Pollution in Israel and Palestine”

Submitted: 13 May 2024

Accepted: 26 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Valentina-Mariana Manoiu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p285

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Afzal Shah
Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I think that the title of this paper is not adequate to its content. Although in the title is written "... Israel-Palestinian conflict region", the papers analyzed for water pollution does not refer to the period of conflict. To my opinion water pollution is not a question of a conflict. I suggest that the title should be reformulated.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes the study methods are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes. it is clear.
I would like to stress out that in the DISCUSSION the authors does not mention any reference. (?!)

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION is accurate, except for the last paragraph were "...Israeli-Palestinian conflict region" is mention again, apart from the title. I don't see the point of using this word, as the hole review is not dealing with any consequence of the conflict on water quality. Instead the review is analyzing different papers focused on water quality in different water bodies in the region.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are some references not cited in the text:
5. Baalousha, H., (2011). Water scarcity and environmental problems in the Gaza Strip, Palestine: origin, impacts and prospects for solutions in Water Shortages: Environmental, Economic and Social Impacts. Nova Science Publishers, pp 79-104
21. Gvirtzman, H., (2012). The Israeli-Palestinian water conflict: an Israeli perspective. Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies.
36. Salameh, M.T.B., Alraggad, M., Harahsheh, S.T., (2021). The water crisis and the

conflict in the Middle East, Sustainable Water Resources Management, Vol. 7, Issue. 5. DOI:10.1007/s40899-021-00549-1

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Could be better by adding a few details, especially the duration of the review period.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the authors clearly stated their objectives, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article, but the structure of the sentence and paragraph is very poor. I would recommend the authors to rewrite the manuscript to improve the proses.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I am confused how the authors generated Word Cloud. Did they use the Keywords found in the 14 papers ($14 \times 5 = 70$ words, assuming they have 5 key words in each paper)? GIS appears in the top list and the authors linked it to the method and yet very little is shown in the result.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I have a lot of concerns. See my comments in the reviewed manuscript.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The authors summarized the manuscript well at the end, but I have low confidence on the authors' discussion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

not consistent:

3. Baalousha, H.M., (2008).

4. Baalousha, H., (2011).

5. Baalousha, H., (2011).

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-010-0135-0>

10.1016/j.jaridenv.2009.03.001

DOI: 10.2478/s11535-010-0108-z

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the comments in the attached document

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Non detected by me

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the article is clear and no error was detected by me.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The effect of the conflict on water pollution of the conflict area is not discussed in the article. The title will be appropriate if a section is added in the manuscript and that section should discuss the effect of conflict on water pollution level of the conflict region

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes and no

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

List could be better to extend by including some more updated articles

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
