



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3899
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METAL CONTENT IN ACACIA SALIGNA AND ACACIA POLYACANTHA ON SLIME DAMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PHYTOREMEDIATION

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	“Heavy metal content in <i>Acacia saligna</i> and <i>Acacia polyacantha</i> on slime dams: Implications for phytoremediation” by D.R. Masvoda, P. Dzomba, F. Mhandu, and B. Masamha. Bindura University of Science Education, Biological Sciences Dept., P. Bag 1020, Bindura (DRM; FM); Bindura University of Science Education, Chemistry Dept., P. Bag 1020, Bindura (PD); and Bindura University of Science Education, Environmental Science Dept., P. Bag 1020, Bindura, Zimbabwe (BM). British Journal of Biotechnology Manuscript No. 2013_BBJ_3899. Review done April 5, 2013. Little information is available from Zimbabwe, so this paper provides useful information. However, the English is poor, and, especially because it has been submitted to the British Journal of Biotechnology, it needs to be in perfect English. The manuscript needs editing for English before it can be published. The Abstract is not clear. In the “Place and Duration of Study,” where is Bindura University of Science Education? The country is not given.	All sections corrected as per reviewer suggestions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Under “Methodology,” “both sites” are mentioned, but two sites have not been defined. Later in the Abstract, under “Results” the two sites are mentioned (“slimes and control sites”). But the “slime” site is not defined. It is not defined in the Abstract or in the paper. What makes the slime? What is a slime site? What is a “slime dam” (as stated in the title)? What was the control soil? It is not cited in Materials and Methods. Where did the control soil come from? How was it known it was a control (i.e., not polluted by the mining activities)? The authors need to describe what the two plants are. Is acacia a small tree? What kind of plant is it? How did the two acacias differ? Was one taller than the other? Did the leaves look different? How old were the acacias when they were sampled? How long had they been growing at the two sites? What, exactly, were the dates of the experiment? When were the plant parts and soil sampled (exact dates)? What was the soil type (both the common name based on the soil triangle and the scientific name	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	based on either the USDA or FAO system)? What was the mine? That is, what was being mined at the mine near the slime dams where sampling was carried out? In the Equations on l. 171 and l. 181, what are the units for each parameter (BAF, Cplant, Csoil, SRQ, S, and R)? What does PT stand for in Table 2? What do the vertical bars mean in Figs 2, 3, 4, and 6?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		