



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_51262
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the source of thallium contamination in ground and surface waters in the locality of Yamtenga (Burkina-Faso): correlation with some heavy metal ions
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

	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>The ABSTRACT is not written in the style of the journal.</p> <p>FIGURES 1 through 5 should be moved to the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. Author can use description of area, etc in MATERIALS AND METHODS.</p> <p>TABLE 1 and TABLE 2 is more appropriate in RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. Author should hold figures and tables for the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.</p> <p>Author is encouraged to organize actual data/information in RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p>	<p>1. Lines 3 to 6: the title was capitalized as recommended.</p> <p>2. Lines 7 to 8: the summary was put in the newspaper's format.</p> <p>3. Line 22: spaces were removed for µg/L units</p> <p>4. Lines 91 to 93: a sentence was added for the description of the activities carried out in the study area in the past years.</p> <p>5. Line 95: figure 1 illustrates the description of the study area and doesn't represent any result. Therefore, this figure cannot be in the results and discussion section.</p> <p>6. Lines 95, 143, 154, 156, 158, 174, 176, 184, 238: the word "figure" was rewritten "FIG" as requested by the reviewer.</p> <p>7. Lines 109-115: this paragraph was reorganized in agreement with the criticism of the reviewer.</p> <p>8. Lines 137 to 185: a sub-point (denoted 3.1. Methodological approach for the delimitation of the study area) was added in the section "3. Results and discussion". Figs 2 to 5 were moved into this sub-point in accordance with the remarks of the reviewer. The same is true for Table 1. In addition, Figs 6 to 8 were moved into this sub-point because they are related to the previous figures.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a useful study with a great deal of information.</p> <p>Further organization of data should be made to separate MATERIALS AND METHODS and RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.</p>	<p>In this revision, more advanced data organization was done to separate the material and the methods and the results and the discussion.</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	<p>There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>