



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_3913
Title of the Manuscript:	Persistent organochlorine compounds in the water and sediments from the Bosuntwi Lake in Ghana

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript reports on an area of study which I believe are needed in that part of Ghana. However authors have given poor presentation, lacking substance and not exciting or interesting. The whole study lacks direction and insight as to why such a study was embarked on, since authors claimed the lake in question had been studied by Darko et al. (2008). • One major inherent problem has been English apart from the poor style of technical writing. The paper contains several grammatical, spelling, constructional errors and repetitive language which are quite serious. • A gross error which authors kept repeating was the name of the Lake; is not Bosumtwilake. The name is Lake Bosomtwi. Additionally, a map of the study site was lacking. Names of rivers or lakes mentioned should begin with block 	<p>We do not agree. Darko et al (2008) studied only few organochlorine pesticides in the study area. Even for the organochlorine pesticides they reported on only on lindane, DDT, DDE, aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, chlordane. They did not address most of the degradation products formed in the environment by these compounds. Their study failed to address other typical OCs such as indicator PCB. Thus their study was limited in scope. Our investigation therefore seeks to broaden the scope of organochlorine pollution in the study area.</p> <p>English style of writing will be improved</p> <p>We agree. Correction will be done. The name can also be Lake Bosomtwi, not only Lake Bosomtwi.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>letters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The style of writing and referencing do not conform to journal's format/guidelines. Font size was inconsistent in some portions. • Several articles in this area abound in literature. Authors should access the net for more information or ideas to re-write the paper. • My recommendation is to reject the manuscript for publication. <p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title: I suggest is written as-“Persistent organochlorine compounds in water and sediment samples from lake Bosumtwiin Ghana”. • Abstract– Needs overhauling • Lines 34-36: remove comma and put organochlorine pesticides and indicator polychlorinated biphenyls in brackets. Put pause after investigated and delete 	<p>We agree. This has been addressed in the revised paper</p> <p>We disagree to reviewer recommendation that the manuscript be rejected for publication. This study has broadened the scope of organochlorine pollution of the Lake.</p> <p>We agree. Correction effected.</p> <p>Abstract has been written to conform to journal format</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>whatever follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 37: Put it as “Samples of water and sediments..... • Lines37-40: Simplify these lines as “Liquid-liquid extraction with hexane was used for the water samples while sediment samples were sonicated in ultrasonic bath with hexane/acetone mixture (3:1). • Line 41: simply as, “quantified with gas chromatography”. • Lines 41-42: You never evaluate a method by recovery studies. It seems wrong expression has been used. Authors are contradicting validation with quality control procedures. <p>(We agree, correction is effected. Recovery studies is now captured under quality control procedures)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 42-45: These lines could be simplified and made very brief. Repetitions should be avoided. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section was poorly written. Authors 	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>are silent on the sources of the organochlorine compounds to the lake. Literature review was written as if organochlorine pesticides are still being used and not banned because of farming, lines 70-77. Lines 60-69 need reorganization.</p> <p>(We agree on the fact that we were silent on sources of OCs to the lake. However, we do not agree on reviewer comment that literature review was written as if OCPs are still being used. The statement that “OCPs had been used in the past in Ghana” means historical use.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript lacks a study area description, not all audience of the esteemed journal may know Ghana. <p>(We agree. This has been addressed in the revised paper)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors mention 12 communities and 10 sampling locations; are they sure they had 10 sampling points? My guess is they should have had 12 locations per their 	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>description.</p> <p>(There were ten sampling locations. Correction is done)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In which season was the sampling done? Was it a whole year study? How many samples were taken in all? <p>(These have been addressed in the Abstract)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't agree with authors on the sampling containers used and their reason. The best containers are Teflon. • Why did they wrap the sediments in Al foil? <p>(Sediments were wrap in Al foil to prevent contamination)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many details in extraction and cleaning are not necessary. • Authors never indicated the incorporation of QA/QC in the work. 	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This section is similar to the others mentioned so far. Language problem and poor discussion.• The meaning of LOD was stated but the value was not quoted• Darko et al. (2008) recently studied this lake. However authors couldn't tell why the need for this study. What gap were they filling? What was missing in the earlier studies? Thus it is not surprising the current study also obtained the same results. Above all they never made any comparison with Darko et al's work as well as other references cited to draw conclusions.• Lines 365-370: You cannot use a single analysis to justify the quality of the lake. Have authors done any monitoring studies? <p>(We do not agree. One year monitoring was done. Sampling and analysis were done three times within the monitoring period. This is captured in the study plan)</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Conclusion Are authors suggesting that organochlorines pesticides banned in Ghana are still in use? How are the PCBs reaching these lakes? They indicated the PCBs were in transformers, but authors were silent on how they ended up in the lake?</p> <p>Reference Authors should follow reference style of the journal. Web pages are normally given accessed dates.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>See above</p>	