



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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Lines 71 – 73: Should be rewritten for clarity. Also in his study of soil..... Whose study? Lines 95 – 99: More light should be thrown on the human activities at the sampling stations, especially stations 1 and 3, which could affect the final results. Are the 3 sampling stations on the same river? What are the distances apart? Which of the stations is the control or reference point Lines 82 – 83: Total Dissolved Solids is not a nutrient (lines 2, 12, 168, 171 and 178). Lines 123 – 124: “showed wide fluctuations....” ”There is not significant difference” is not possible. Please rewrite this section. Lines 168 – 169: The sampling period presented in Table 2 and Figures 1 – 6 did not correspond with eighteen months sampling period written in lines 10, 93 and 94. Table 2: The unit of measurement for TDS is milligram/litre (mg/l) and not NTU Line 204: A river cannot be referred as “lentic in nature (Line 221 -“ lotic water bodies”)	This aspect has been reworded. They are separate water bodies in different communities in Abuja It is one of the parameters measured. There is significant difference. This has also been corrected to reflect 12 months The correct unit has been inserted It has been effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 2: The use of the word “Composition” in the title of the manuscript does not seem appropriate. I suggest a change Line 77: The use of the term “baseline” is not proper for a “Brown” environment (i.e. an environment already impacted by human activities. I suggest that the word “Benchmark” should be used instead. Line 83: The cations – calcium, potassium and sodium cannot be evaluated without magnesium. These cations have a particular distribution pattern in natural waters (eg. $Mg > Ca > K > Na$). Author(s) should consider adding Magnesium in this work if possible. Line 127: should read “There was not seasonal variation” Line 209: “The effluent discharges” should be changed to “Run offs from” Line 245: Greendwood or Greenwood. No page numbers is included in this reference.	We intend to retain the word. Benchmark has been used instead of baseline. Mg is not included. Effectuated Effectuated Effectuated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I believe that with these observations addressed, the manuscript will be publishable. Thank you.	