

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_130133
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Selected Heavy Metals in Sediments from Ndambuk River, Busia County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok,	

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Please write at the end of the abstract about circular economy.	ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Your text is scientifically sound, but a few improvements can enhance its clarity, precision, and adherence to standard scientific writing conventions. Below is a detailed analysis and suggestions for improvement:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Clear Purpose:</b> The objective of the study is well-defined: examining the pollution effects of heavy metals in sediments from River Nambu.</li><li><b>Key Findings Highlighted:</b> The discussion of heavy metal levels relative to WHO permissible limits provides clear insights.</li><li><b>Quantitative Analysis:</b> The use of pollution indices like the deaccumulation index, pollution load index, contamination factor, and enrichment factor strengthen the study's analytical rigor.</li></ol> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Terminology Consistency:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Instead of "WHO permissible limits," specify whether these are "WHO soil/sediment quality guidelines" or "WHO recommended limits for heavy metals in sediments."</li></ul></li><li><b>Detail on Sampling Methodology:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mention the number of sampling points and their distribution across the study area.</li><li>Include information about sediment sampling protocols (e.g., depth, frequency, and equipment).</li></ul></li><li><b>Statistical Analysis:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Clarify whether statistical tests were performed to compare metal concentrations between seasons.</li><li>Discuss whether the observed seasonal differences (e.g., Pb levels) are statistically significant.</li></ul></li><li><b>Interpretation of Results:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provide a rationale for seasonal variations in Pb levels. For instance, explain if these changes could be due to hydrological conditions, land use, or anthropogenic activities.</li></ul></li></ol>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Effectted revision</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>Noted and done</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Add more recent published article reference like <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.efmat.2024.12.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.efmat.2024.12.005</a> and DOI <a href="https://doi.org/10.1039/D2VA00002D">https://doi.org/10.1039/D2VA00002D</a>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	