

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_77014
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL AND MONTHLY CHANGES IN INTERSTITIAL WATER PHYSICO-CHEMISTRY OF BODO CREEK
Type of the Article	

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

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I believe the results are interesting from the point of view of conservation and protection of local aquatic biodiversity; however, the manuscript needs to be improved, especially in highlighting a better interpretation and discussion of the results and environmental contextualization with the current land occupation scenario.</p> <p>(i) What is the hypothesis of this study?</p> <p>(ii) A more detailed description of the land use and occupation (Figure 1) that influence the water quality of the study environment would be pertinent to contextualize the possible causes of degradation of environmental quality.</p> <p>(iii) A detailed description of climate, geologic, pedological and vegetation should be included in the manuscript, as this information helps in interpreting the results.</p> <p>(iv) Please, check this information: "Hydrogen ion concentration (pH) ranged from 3.5 to 9.6."</p> <p>(v) The figures of the results of the limnological variables must be redone, a single figure containing all the graphics would be interesting and would facilitate the reading and interpretation of the text.</p> <p>(vi) What can resample after an oil spill provide information regarding improvement or deterioration in water quality? How was the water quality at the time of the spills?</p> <p>(vii) In the discussion, a relationship between the measured limnological variables and possible environmental causes in relation to anthropogenic actions in the region needs to be inserted as the authors concluded that the water quality is not in accordance with WHO. For example, are DO and BOD only related to decomposition organic matter?</p> <p>(viii) What are the authors' proposals regarding the use of the results obtained for the conservation/preservation of water in the region studied? what is the purpose of this study? What can one conclude about the past spill about the current state of water quality?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Marcela Bianchessi da Cunha Santino
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), Brazil