



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough English editing is required The problem is not well developed in the introduction section. Authors should identify the motivation for this research. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 18-19 should be revised. It is not clear 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. 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. METHODOLOGY should be re-written for someone interested in redoing or replicating a similar work in the future. Line 79-80: What security reasons? Did this research follow ethical authorization by local authorities? If yes, which authority? If not, why? 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. Revise lines 103 – 109 by making it more lively. Line 112: Which 'literature' are the authors referring to? Cite them here. Line 118: NRC and EPA? You mean those of USA 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harold Wilson Tumwitike Mapoma
Department, University & Country	University of Malawi, Malawi