



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_40835
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of some physico-chemical variables on hydrogen sulphide levels in Lake Burullus sediments, Egypt
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	<p>Title: Specify what the impact is. In my opinion, it is more appropriate to change to "Relation of some!"</p> <p>Keywords: why pollution was a keyword? This concept must be discussed in the manuscript to be validated.</p> <p>Abstract: the objectives must be explained, and what is the justification for studying the hydrogen sulphide (the environmental issue).</p> <p>Introduction: This section should be greatly improved; it should provide information that leads to an understanding the environmental problem to be addressed.</p> <p>What is the importance of presentation of the chemical reactions in the introduction?</p> <p>Lines 27-36: This description must be inserted in the materials and methods section.</p> <p>Objectives should be reviewed and specified.</p> <p>No hypothesis was presented in the manuscript. What is the hypothesis?</p> <p>Materials and Methods: How were the samplings?</p> <p>What equipment was used?</p> <p>What is the depth of the collected samples?</p> <p>How was the interstitial water of the sediment fractionated?</p> <p>What are the characteristics of sediments, as granulometry and organic matter?</p> <p>I did not understand why the results were expressed in fresh bases of <i>Eichhornia crassipes</i></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>(macrophyte).</p> <p>The limnological parameters were measured only in the water? Why not in the interstitial water from the sediment?</p> <p>In analytical methods, organic matter and BOD was not specified. Also In results, the EC data was not presented.</p> <p>No equation for the statistical analysis must be present in the manuscript. Only the reference is sufficient.</p> <p>How maps of limnological parameters was elaborated?</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>Line 176: The r was not negative?</p> <p>As I pointed, why macrophyte basis was used in results? The presence of these organisms must be inserted in the description area. What is the biomass per area of these organisms in each sampling point? How decomposition of these organisms may interfere in the hydrogen sulphide concentration?</p> <p>Many points in the discussion were not contextualized. See Paragraph in the Line 136 and 143. The pH in the study area is elevated (meaning a basic medium). How to connect with the Abbas et al. (2001) results?</p> <p>The discussion must be deeply improved. How the information (toxicity, poison) in the introduction correlated with the biota of the study area.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The conclusions must respond the objectives. Again, what are the objectives of the present study?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcela Bianchessi da Cunha Santino
Department, University & Country	Departamento de Hidrobiologia, Federal University of São Carlos, Brazil