

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 | research |

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. | The study provides valuable insights into the environmental impacts of artisanal and small-scale gold mining in Niger. The research highlights the significant environmental risks associated with cyanidation and acidification waste | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, the title "Assessment of Metal Enrichment in the Koma Bangou (Niger) Gold Panning Area Soils and Tailings" accurately reflects the content and scope of the work | |
| 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, the abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the main points of the article. To further improve the abstract, consider: Using more descriptive language (e.g., "significant" instead of "very low"). | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The current structure provides a clear and logical flow | |
| 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. | The use of portable XRF analyzer and ICP-MS data provides robust geochemical data for assessing metal enrichment. The research highlights significant environmental risks associated with cyanidation and acidification waste. The study's findings have important implications for environmental policy and regulation in the region | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes the references sufficient and 50 % recent. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is clear and concise, making it suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor revisions are necessary to enhance clarity, grammar, and precision. 1. Inconsistent verb tenses (e.g., switching between past and present tense). 2. Missing articles ("a," "the") in some places. 3. Commas and semicolons usage requires review. Some sentences are wordy or convoluted; consider rephrasing. | |
| Optional/General comments | Based on the significance of the findings and the overall quality of the manuscript, I recommend acceptance with minor revisions. | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | R. Nagalakshmi |
| Department, University & Country | Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, India |