



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10862
Title of the Manuscript:	Composition and dynamics of some nutrient levels in Jabi dam, Lower Usuma dam and Gwagwalada river in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The title of this manuscript is confusing to the readers, I m suggesting the title to be “Composition and dynamics of some nutrient levels in the lower course of Gwagwalada River Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria”. This manuscript, In its current form, the level of English throughout your manuscript did not meet the journal's desired standard. There are a number of grammatical errors and instances of badly worded/constructed sentences. Please check the manuscript and refine the language carefully. The methodology used in this study did not provide any useful information on the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) of the data used in this study. Please run One-way ANOVA to test the significance differences in the nutrient level between Jabi Dam, Usuma, Dam and Gwagwalada River. Report the F test, the significant value and the degree of freedom. Moreover, run post hoc multiple comparison test using either Bonferroni or Tukey HSD to find the pair wise differences between the water bodies. Table 2 contain 12 months data, while from your abstract, you reported the study covered 18 months. This is confusing, please check and report all your descriptive statistics. Table 3 revealed seasonal mean value of nutrient elements from the studied water bodies. It would have been nice if the	Effected Carefully done. These are standard methodologies in water quality assessment. The data is already analysed Effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	authors run PAIRED SAMPLE T'test to test the hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the nutrient level between the water bodies.	The data is analysed in its present for to see the level of significant among the three water bodies
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ms has too many typographical and English language errors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		