

Editorial Comments:

I have checked the materials.

Although two of three reviewers concluded that this paper is acceptable, another one reviewer still asks the revision of the manuscript.

Thus, I concluded that this paper is acceptable only after the revision of the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.

Author's Feedback:

Our discussion does not suggest the use of water and the monitoring of data only.

We extensively gave detailed interpretation of our data and compared our results with those found in literature.

Also, the interpretation of the significance of our findings was provided and recommendations were suggested accordingly- not the use of water and the monitoring of data only.

Furthermore, the results and discussion section was separated and revised fully now for any reader to understand clearly our results and the scientific interpretation of our data.

This research work is novel in the area covered because it is the first of its kind to be conducted. As we clearly mentioned that the dearth of information on the water quality in Katsina State necessitates the current work. We also mentioned at the end of the introduction that this research was aimed at determining: "the levels of physico-chemical parameters and the concentrations of Zinc and Iron in domestic waters of Katsina metropolis in order to ascertain the drinking water quality for human consumption".

Therefore, we want to appreciate the efforts of the reviewers for their expertise and valuable comments regarding the peer-review of our manuscript.