

# Review of: "Probabilistic Assessment of the Heavy Metal Pollution in Debrecen's Topsoil"

Salomon Bertrant Bisse<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Ngaoundéré

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

There are some grammatical and style issues through the manuscript. I suggest that the manuscript be proofread by someone with English as a first language

1. **Title.** I suggest the authors to modify the title, please specify all the methods used in Title section « this study uses deterministic approaches and probabilistic methods »
2. **Abstract.** Please provide information about the study area (Debrecen). The innovation is not obvious and it is necessary to point out research significances.
3. **Introduction.**

The objective is clear but needs more evidences. State clearly what are the scientific problems and new insights of this study.

According to the authors, this study uses deterministic approaches and probabilistic methods . Kindly describe and reference this approach and methods.

## 1. Materials and methods

Add more details about the number of samples. How many from urban and non urban area

Add some typical field photos. Besides, add more analytical details and analytical precision of the portable handheld Niton XL5Plus X-ray fluorescence (XRF) analyzer.

How reliable is the portable handheld Niton XL5Plus X-ray fluorescence (XRF) analyzer for the analyses of trace elements concentration and element pollutant. I think ICP-MS and ICP-AES methods are more reliables for such analyses

## 1. Results and discussion

Many inferences in this section are only derived from single mathematical and correlational analysis, which usually leads to a wrong interpretation. Therefore, many inferences are suggestive (not conclusive). I strongly suggest that authors provide more evidence to support their conclusions. Besides, the discussion in this section is not deep and thorough. I recommend authors to add more statistical such as *PCA* and *HCA*

I recommend the authors to split "Results and Discussions" as two sections. The Discussion section puts your results into

a larger perspective susceptible of attracting the attention of an international readership. The results must be presented in an objective way, with some explanations, but the general interpretation is provided in a separate Discussion section which examines the meaning of the results. The Discussion section is the place to interpret the results obtained and to place them in the broader context of other studies from the literature. It will enlarge the scope of your paper and attract a larger attention from the scientific community.

## 1. Reference

Authors should check the reference format throughout the text and in the reference list.