



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_37445
Title of the Manuscript:	Macro- and trace elements in freshwater lake sediments in the south of West Siberia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	This is a good and interesting paper that falls into the scope of the journal. Some minor comments to take into account before its publication: - Change title, since it not reflected the real focus of the study; think in o one more interesting and not only purely descriptive (take into account in the international audience of the journal). - Add more interesting questions and/or hypothesis. -In M&M section please add information about reference material if used. - Check please for normality and homogeneity of data prior to apply PCA. - The conclusions and main results (findings) of the study should be in a more synthetic form, in the present form they are too speculative and seems to be more final considerations than purely conclusions of your study.	Thank you very much! We absolutely agree that descriptive titles are not the best ones to attract the attention of the potential audience. However, we failed to combine both macro- and trace elements in one title. We are afraid we can not do this, as the main aim of this pilot study was simply to attract the attention to the potential role of the small and shallow lakes in regional carbon storage, on one hand, and to underscore their unique biogeochemical character in view of the perspective agricultural use. We are afraid we did not use any reference. If you mean references for trace elements' analyses, the Analytical Center for multielement and isotope analyses" of the Institute of Geology and Mineralogy SBRAS (Novosibirsk, Russia) uses references as required by certifying authorities. . PCA is simply a rigid rotation of the original data matrix. Since we use it for exploratory/visualisation purposes, rather than modelling ones, then normality is not a strict requirement. But the reviewer is correct in that PCA may work better for multivariate normal data. The reviewer is quite right – we wrote our conclusion according to advice about writing a conclusion to a research paper: the point of such conclusion is to summarize one's argument for the reader and, what may be more important, to call the reader to action/non-action, indicating the perspective/prospects/pitfalls etc. of the future research. So, yes, it was our intention to write the conclusion rather speculatively to attract attention to certain points, which might seem trivial, but we believe to be important.
Optional/General comments		