

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125865
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Metal Enrichment in the Koma Bangou (Niger) Gold panning Area Soils and Tailings
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important because it examines the extent of environmental soil contamination resulting from traditional mining. Determining the extent of soil contamination and its dispersion around the mined area is valuable for the health of humans and other organisms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. But it is better to write the concentration of contaminant elements quantitatively in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript examines the level of pollution in traditional mining methods in a completely scientific and accurate manner. The proper use of tables and graphs has contributed significantly to a better and greater understanding of the subject.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	AzizOllah Tajvar
Department, University & Country	Chabahar Maritime University, Iran