



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Natural water bodies around the city of Macapá in Brazil, which had important ecological and environmental functions, were often occupied, and their water qualities were worth studying. Although the data seemed not enough, this study could give valuable information for the local water body management. But there were some questions in the manuscript showed below. 1) In the second sentence of “Study design” of the ABSTRACT, “APHA(1995)” should be “APHA(1998)”. 2) Line 41 in the “INTRODUCTION” section, there were two “waste disposal”. 3) In the “MATERIAL AND METHOD” section, the size and water depth of Lagoon of the Indians in dry and rainy periods should have been provided. 4) In the “MATERIAL AND METHOD” section, 5 sites sampled were not enough, or there were at least triplicate samples in each site. 5) It had better to give statistical methods in the “MATERIAL AND METHOD” section. 6) Table 1, not one of the results, should be included in the “MATERIAL AND METHOD”	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	section. 7) It was a mistake in Figure 3 that only had the copies of the charts in Figure 2. 8) It had better to use coefficient of variation(CV, $CV = \text{Standard deviation} / \text{Mean}$) to represent variability of the parameters in Table 2. Given all that, the authors had better to answer the questions and revise the manuscript before the paper is considered to be re-commented.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Jinan University, China