



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_20354
Title of the Manuscript:	Health risk Assessment of water polluted with fluoride in the mining area in southern Tunisia: The case of the region of Berka
Type of the Article	Case Study

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thorough English editing is required 2. The problem is not well developed in the introduction section. Authors should identify the motivation for this research. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. English is improved. 2. From line 19 to line 23.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 18-19 should be revised. It is not clear 2. Line 38: "... is contaminated by discharges...." This phrase requires some examples of specific or probable contaminants suspected to contaminate the water since the authors know the sources. 3. Line 49: "...mainly from the surface water table..." What does 'surface water table' mean? They meant shallow water table or surface water? There is no such thing as surface water table. 4. METHODOLOGY should be re-written for someone interested in redoing or replicating a similar work in the future. 5. Line 79-80: What security reasons? Did this research follow ethical authorization by local authorities? If yes, which authority? If not, why? 6. Lines 95-99 should be properly presented. In their current form they look like bullets. Either present as a table or write in a paragraph form. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's revised: "In his research work in hydrogeology, ... in the mining area of Gafsa" 2. Contaminants are coming from phosphate mine waste lavatory in Moulares and Redeyef towns. 3. Indeed, it's shallow water table. 4. The method of "Kinney" and its parameters are more detailed from line 75 to line 96: "The Kinney method is based on..." 5. In the study period, our country was in a state of emergency after the revolution. So, traveling from a region to another is sometimes difficult, if not impossible. 6. Results are presented in table 4. 7. Risk assessment results are more detailed from



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>7. Revise lines 103 – 109 by making it more lively.</p> <p>8. Line 112: Which ‘literature’ are the authors referring to? Cite them here.</p> <p>9. Line 118: NRC and EPA? You mean those of USA or in Tunisia there are such authorities? Be specific. In USA it is called USEPA and NRC of USA should be written as NRC of USA in that order. A lot of countries of such regulatory bodies. Although you cited the reference, it is not a guarantee that readers will search for the exact NRC and EPA in the cited reference.</p> <p>10. Line 123 – 125: Where do readers find Dr. John Colquhoun and his statement? The statement is abruptly introduced and has no reference cited.</p> <p>11. Line 130: Add ‘to’ between said and potable</p>	<p>line 116 to 133 and in tables 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p>8. They are references 11, 12 and 13. 11. Connett P. 50 Reasons to Oppose Fluoridation. Med Veritas. 2004;1:70–80. 12. Committee on Fluoride in Drinking Water, Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Division on Earth and Life Studies, et al. Fluoride in Drinking Water: A Scientific Review of EPA’s Standards. National Academies Press. 2007. Accessed 7 Apr 2012. Available: http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11571&page=R1. 13. Fluoride action network. 10 Facts About Fluoride. 2012. Accessed 7 Apr 2012. Available: http://www.fluoridealert.org/fluoride-facts.htm</p> <p>9. We mean the USEPA and NRC of USA.</p> <p>10. Line 147: reference 14 is added: 14. Colquhoun J. Why I changed my mind about Fluoridation. Perspect Biol Med.1997;41(1):29-44.</p> <p>11. Line 155: “Water is said to be potable”.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		