



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_44742
Title of the Manuscript:	Fluoride Distribution in Aquatic Environment in Vicinity of Aluminum Industry and its Correlation with Rainwater Chemistry and Weather Parameter. A case study of Renukoot, District Sonbhadra, Uttar Pradesh
Type of the 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>)

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	<p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract is too brief and needs additional information.....how the methods were applied, results and the major findings of the study.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction is well written but entirely the whole portion is from the internet and most of the references are not current. The authors should consider rephrasing the introduction to avoid plagiarism and they should also include literature from peer reviewed journals.</p> <p>Materials and methods</p> <p>It would be good to include a map of the study area Authors only stated 33 samples were collected. Why did you take 33 samples and what was the intervals between the sampling points, sampling frequency etc. Your sampling method should be detailed.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>The authors seem to focus their results and discussion more on the use of rainwater for irrigation purposes. The focus of the manuscript seems to be missing and I do not understand what the authors are trying to put across in this manuscript. The discussion should focus more on the topic of this manuscript.</p>	<p>Abstract has been modified</p> <p>Introduction part has been restructured</p> <p>Method part has been rectified and upgraded</p> <p>Discussion part has been corrected as well</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 13:industerization should be industrialization.</p> <p>Line 13: from To monitoring to Line 16: the sentences are ambiguous and must be rephrased for better understanding by readers</p> <p>Line 43 & 45: Fluoride is F⁻ not F₋.</p> <p>Authors should take note of a few grammatical and typographical errors and wrong spellings.</p>	<p>All corrections have been done based on the comments of the reviewer</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors need to take a serious look at this manuscript and do a major revision.</p>	