

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122805
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution, ecological and health risk assessment of trace metals in water and sediments from Kossan River, southern Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive assessment of trace metal contamination in the Kossan River, an area impacted by human activities. By employing rigorous methodologies to analyze sediment and water samples, the study contributes valuable data that can inform environmental monitoring and public health policies. The findings highlight the urgent need for ongoing surveillance of aquatic ecosystems, particularly in regions facing anthropogenic pressures. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough approach and the emphasis on both ecological and health risk assessments, which are crucial for understanding the broader implications of metal contamination on human health and the environment. However, I would have liked to see more discussion on potential remediation strategies to address the identified contamination issues</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Distribution, ecological and health risk assessment of trace metals in water and sediments from Kossan River, southern Côte d'Ivoire," is suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the study. It indicates that the research involves both the distribution of trace metals and their associated ecological and health risks, which are key components of the investigation.</p> <p>However, an alternative title could be: "Assessing Trace Metal Contamination and Associated Risks in the Kossan River Ecosystem, Côte d'Ivoire." This title maintains the essential elements of the original while emphasizing the assessment aspect and the ecosystem context.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive as it outlines the study's aims, methodology, key findings, and conclusions regarding trace metal contamination in the Kossan River. It effectively highlights the significance of the research in relation to human health and environmental risks. However, I suggest the following additions for clarity and completeness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Including specific numerical results or ranges for the concentrations of trace metals found in the water and sediments would provide a clearer picture of the contamination levels. 2-A brief mention of the anthropogenic activities contributing to the contamination (e.g., agricultural practices, illegal gold panning) could enhance the understanding of the study's relevance. 3-Adding a sentence about the need for monitoring or potential remediation strategies could strengthen the conclusion and emphasize the practical implications of the research 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for the content and objectives of the study. The organization follows a logical flow, beginning with an introduction that sets the context and importance of the research. The methodology section is clearly defined, detailing the sampling sites and analytical techniques used, which is crucial for reproducibility.</p> <p>The results are presented systematically, allowing for a clear understanding of the findings related to trace metal concentrations and their ecological and health risks. The conclusion effectively summarizes the key points and implications of the study. However, to enhance clarity, the manuscript could benefit from clearer headings or subheadings within the results section to differentiate between findings related to water and sediment analyses. This would help readers quickly locate specific information and improve the overall readability of the manuscript. Additionally, including a discussion section that interprets the results in the context of existing literature could further enrich the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis of trace metal contamination in the Kossan River. The use of established techniques, such as atomic absorption spectroscopy for metal concentration measurements, ensures reliable and accurate data collection. Additionally, the study employs various contamination indices and health risk assessment parameters, which provide a multifaceted understanding of the ecological and human health implications of trace metal exposure. The thorough sampling strategy, covering multiple stations over an extended period, further enhances the validity of the findings, allowing for a more representative assessment of the river's contamination levels. Overall, the manuscript adheres to scientific standards, making it a valuable contribution to the field of environmental monitoring and public health</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be a mix of recent and relevant studies, which is essential for supporting the research findings and situating the study within the current scientific discourse. However, the manuscript could benefit from including more recent references, particularly those published within the last few years. There are a few suggestions for additional references that could enhance the manuscript: - Journal of Food Composition and Analysis, 2021, 99, 103880. Desalination and Water Treatment, 2020, 179, pp. 263–271</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript employs a formal tone and uses appropriate scientific terminology, which is essential for conveying complex concepts clearly to the target audience. The structure of the sentences is mostly coherent, and the ideas are presented logically, facilitating understanding of the research objectives, methods, and findings.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Esrafil Asgari</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Zanjan University of Medical Sciences, Iran</p>