SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Chemical Science Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_ACSj_11705**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Physico-chemical characterization of Lagoon of the Indians in Macapá-AP-Brazil**
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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The manuscript contains an interesting dataset for which I encourage publication but the paper in the present form is not suitable for an international readership. First of all, I strongly recommend English editing because some paragraphs are well written but others contain several mistakes. The way data are presented is too similar to a technical report. A serious statistical analysis lacks and the data interpretation could be improved also with meteorological data. I think data on precipitation can be available to better support the conclusion that the substances are less concentrated in the rainy season. In this case a correlation between parameters and precipitation will be interesting. Despite the fact that only two observations per site are available I think that a correlation analysis will be interesting also to understand the relationships among all parameters. **The main weakness is that parameters are only presented in relation to law requirements.** In the present discussion parameters are subdivided in relation to law indications but I think that it has to be established if similar environmental pattern exist (input sources, etc.), understand relationships among parameters and with the ecosystem and anthropogenic pressures if possible with quantitative data. **INTRODUTION**: CONAMA resolution is a National law and a better description of its content should be provided. Moreover I will recommend to cite Table 1 in	

	the additional description in this chapter and not in the result section. In this framework, other international regulations should be cited and compared. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:** 1. *Are the data well controlled and robust?* They are well controlled and the methodological protocols are good but there are only two data per site. However, this not the main weakness, interventions in the manuscript must be done to improve their presentation and interpretation **2.** *Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion*: most of the references are not in English. Additional international citations should be added to make comparison with similar area. For the data published in national languages I will encourage to add in this paper a Table to show the values which are compared ***3.*** *Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out.* Figures and Tables of the present data are clear and sufficient. For figures I recommend to delete the values for each point and the lines which connect the different stations. Lines in general are used for temporal trends and not for spatial distribution. ***4.*** *Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?* I don't recommend excessive statistical analysis but at least a correlation matrix between parameters. In this type of publication is not necessary to explain the what each parameter represent as done for example from line 166-170 but that type of consideration must be	

	inserted in the interpretation during discussion in comparison with the role of other parameters.	
Minor REVISION comments	**CONCLUSION**: *Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript?* Yes, it is but correlation analysis is required to better improve and strength it. REFERENCES: *Are all the references cited relevant and adequate?* no *Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*yes (see previous comments)	
Optional/General comments	**MATERIALS AND METHODS**: methods/process is according international protocols that support their suitability and technical standards. Sufficient details are given as references but I would not require additional description.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Chiara Facca**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Calle Larga Santa Marta 2137, 30123 Venice, Italy**