



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_33213
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Lead-210 In Surface Water nearby a Phosphate Mining at Semi-Arid region In Santa Quitéria, Ceará State, Brazil
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>-It looks like nothing has been done on the revision of the abstract. Refer to the review comments and revise it. - in your methodology, write 'coprecipitation' and 'univariate'</p> <p>Line 82: revisit this one, there are unnecessary upper case letters</p> <p>Lines 98, 113, 134, 194, 209, 210, 219 and 221: insert space in between words</p> <p>Line 142: be consistent i.e. full name of ANOVA</p> <p>Line 147: spacing</p> <p>Line 166:showed that there is a difference.....</p> <p>Line 177: Fisher Test or Fisher's test? Be consistent</p> <p>Line 213: write WHO in full first</p>	<p>We reproduce hereunder the comments made by referee _Car</p> <p>ABSTRACT: - what is NORM? Write in full first then may use abbreviations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rephrase the sentence ".....in a grid six points associated....." - 50 analyses per point??? Really? Is it not 2 analyses per point to make a total of 50 analyses from the 25 points? - What is AC?? <p>(a) NORM stays for Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material and is a very well-known abbreviation such as DNA. Therefor we didn't judge necessary to explain it, but if the referee really wants it, OK. So it this has now been added into the abstract.</p> <p>(b) The sentence that was incorrect has been rephrased, see text highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>(c) In fact, at each of the six points, 25 samples of water were collected along studied period, and for each sample two analyses were made (soluble and particulate). That makes indeed 50 analyses per point.</p> <p>(d) AC was explained at the first line of the abstract that started with the sentence "To report the activity concentrations (AC) of ²¹⁰Pb...". This correction seems to have been overlooked by</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

	<p>the referee, and the authors do not agree with the referee's comment "It looks like nothing has been done on the revision of the abstract." Anyhow, we introduced some other improvements in the abstract. All are in yellow.</p> <p>'Coprecipitation' was corrected in the abstract and at line 64, 'univariate' in the abstract only since it was correctly written all along the text.</p> <p>The upper case letters were used to be more didactic. It appears that this intention was not understood and we decided thus to put all the words in lower case. (see text)</p> <p>All spaces were introduced (see text) except at line 221 where no space is lacking. (*)</p> <p>Since ANOVA was explained at line 82, the full name at line 142 was deleted (see text).</p> <p>Done, see highlighted in yellow colour.</p> <p>Corrected, see highlighted in yellow colour.</p> <p>Fisher's test is now consistently used all along the text (highlighted in yellow colour).</p> <p>We introduced ... the World Health Organization (WHO) ...</p>
--	---