SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_49174
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Anions and Heavy Metals in Sediments from River Sio, Busia County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript achieves the purpose defined in the abstract, it is well structured, it is	,
	scientifically robust and technically sound, but it is not written with care. I'm convinced that	
	the Research is not innovative, but the study allows to increase the knowledge in the	
	studied field.	
	Therefore, I believe that the manuscript can be accepted for publication after the	
	following SERIOUS MAJOR REVISIONS:	
	The manuscript contains numerous errors of spaces and punctuation. The authors must correct this type of error throughout the entire manuscript.	
	The method described in "2.2.1 Analysis of Sediments for Heavy Metals" leaves me some doubts. Why don't authors use hydrofluoric acid?	
	Fig. 1. The authors should unite fig. 1 and fig. 2.	
	Caption of Fig. 2. The authors must replace "Fig. 2. Line graphs showing trends" with "Fig. 2. Bar graphs showing trends"	
	Table 2 . The authors write " *1 = Anions, *2 = Cations". In my opinion, this is superfluous.	
	Caption of Table 4 . Replace "Table 4: metal ion concentration in sediments during the wet and dry seasons" with "Table 4: Metal concentration in sediments during the wet and dry seasons".	
	Line 11. Replace "uv/visible" with "UV/visible".	
	Line 87. Replace "15cm" with "15 cm".	
	Line 97 . Replace "250mL" with "250 mL". The authors must check these errors in entire manuscript.	
	Line 96 . Replace "C" with "C". The authors must check this error in the entire manuscript.	
	Line 100. Replace "whatman" with "Whatman".	
	Line 111. Replace "HCL" with "HCl".	
	Line 112. Replace "HNO3" with "HNO ₃ ".	
	Line 114. Replace "HNO3" with "HNO ₃ ".	
	Line 121. Replace "HCL" with "HCl".	
	Line 191. Replace "analar" with "analytical".	
	Can the authors calculate some indexes to evaluate the quality of the sediments, such as the Geoaccumulation Index (Igeo), the Enrichment Factor (EF), the threshold effect level (TEL) and the probable effect level (PEL) ?	
	See, for example:	
	Mohsen Nowrouzi and Alireza Pourkhabbaz (2014). Application of geoaccumulation index and enrichment factor for assessing metal contamination in the sediments of Hara Biosphere Reserve, Iran, <i>Chemical Speciation & Bioavailability</i> , 26:2, 99-105, DOI:10.3184/095422914X13951584546986.	
	N. Cardellicchio, A. Buccolieri, A.D. Leo, V. Librando, Z. Minniti and L. Spada (2009).	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Methodological approach for metal pollution evaluation in sediments collected from the Taranto Gulf, Toxicological and Environmental Chemistry, 91:7, 1273-1290. DOI: 10.1080/02772240802616494. Moreover, the authors could include these researches in References.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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:	Alessandro Buccolier
Department, University & Country	Universita' Del Salento, Italy

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)