

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_109242
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecological and human health risks assessment of Arsenic in sediments around gold mining areas in northern Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Environment studies are very important for human life quality. With growing population demands grow, industrial and agricultural production grow and so does the environment challenges. So, environment studies are a never-ending endeavour to discover and assess risks and take measures against them. The importance of the research also lies in the methodology which offers new tools for further investigations.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable; it briefly reflects the research aims and strict location.</p> <p>3. Yes, the Abstract synthesizes the aim of the research, location, material and methods, and findings.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well structured and each chapter clearly states the research steps. The Introduction gives good arguments and background for the research and briefly reviews the state of the art of the matter; the Materials and methods are clearly and comprehensively described. However, the nature of the sampled sediments should also be presented. The subtitle 3.1. (The content of arsenic in the organic and humus horizons) seems wrong, as there was no question about sampling sediments by horizons, nor was there a discussion about the nature of the sediments (organic/humus). The data are clearly presented in tables and figures. The Discussions are pertinent, well explanatory, and well backed by literature. The Conclusion gives a clear image of the arsenic contamination risks.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology and the findings are correctly supported by literature and the expression is clear and unequivocal.</p> <p>6. Yes. The background and motivation for the research, the material and methods, and the discussions are well back by rich and fairly recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is correct and clear and the paper is easy to read. I suggest a correction in the last phrase of the subchapter 3.5.1. (Taking account of...)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The approach of several significant indices and total arsenic content fractionation makes the research thorough and compelling.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Lungu
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for soil Science, Romania