

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_109426
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of soil pollution by heavy metals in the market gardening areas of Korsimoro
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The researchers assessed the level of soil pollution by toxic metals in the market gardening areas of Korsimoro, Burkina Faso. They generated valuable data that can be used to evaluate environmental safety and to guide environmental protection by relevant regulatory bodies.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. Though, the name of the country MAY be added and 'Heavy Metals' MAY be replaced with 'Toxic Metals'.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No. The numbering of some subsections were not correctly done and Figure 1 was placed in the wrong subsection. Areas that need to be corrected are highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is partly scientifically correct. Part of the methodology and formulae given are correct but there are few areas of concern highlighted as comments in the manuscript. They include details of the digestion procedure, giving of results per sampling sites especially for Table 5 and report of statistical analysis of data generated.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and mostly recent but the author(s) needs to be consistent with the reference style and use of (upper, lower or sentence) case.</p> <p>7. Some of the analytes such as Cadmium, Arsenic and Mercury are carcinogenic. The author(s) should emphasize the danger of toxicity arising from the high concentrations of these metals in the study area (above permissible limits) as a key part of the discussion of results.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Few areas that require correction have been highlighted as comments within the manuscript.</p> <p>2. There are several joined words within the manuscript. The author(s) need(s) to review the entire manuscript and separate joined words with spaces.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chinyere Ogbodo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria</b>