



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14517
Title of the Manuscript:	Contamination of lettuce plants irrigated with waste water from river Avo'o in Yaounde, Cameroon
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Modify the title as "Contamination of lettuce plants irrigated with waste water in Yaounde, Cameroon" In introduction part include the following references. 1-Water use efficiency and accumulation of trace elements in spinach (<i>Spinacia oleracea</i> L.) irrigated with municipal wastewater. Journal of Medicinal Plants Research. 6(22), (2012), 3882 – 3888. 2- Assessment of heavy metals in wheat plants irrigated with contaminated wastewater. Polish Journal of Environmental Studies. 23(1) (2013) 115–123. 3-Water quality assessment of river Kabul at Peshawar, Pakistan: Industrial and urban wastewater impacts. Journal of Water Chemistry and Technology. 35(4) (2013), 170-176. Remove figure 1. In figure 2, the part (d) average number of dead plants is not discussed in section 3.3, why the number of dead plants increases with the treatment?	Modification of the title and addition of the three papers suggested has been included in the article. In addition, an explanation on the average number of death plants and why this increases with treatment has been provided. Concerning the proposal to remove Fig. 1, we think that it shows in a vivid manner the method of waste discharge and could ease understanding of readers. Hence we have maintained it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		