



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5052
Title of the Manuscript:	Levels of Heavy Metals in and Around Scrap Car Dumpsite at Uwelu, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research paper

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	Introduction: A better justification for this study is needed. Pg 2 line 44 onwards you tend to show that you will be studying on improved analytical methods or decontamination or even impacts/effects of heavy metal contamination. But you end up only determining levels (pg 2 ln 54) , which I find not really enough for a paper. We expect the levels in the dumpsite to be high, so what is new? Please justify your study better. Methods: • Details on study site are needed to give readers an indication of the extent of the activity like size of site, how old the activity has been on-going, sources of scrap metals, why this specific dumpsite was chosen, etc. • More details on sampling frame and regimes – when was it done (dry and wet season), how many samples, collected at what intervals etc	What was indicated on page 2 line 44 is not the aim of this work. The aim of this work as pointed out in last paragraph of the introduction was to determine the concentration of heavy metals in the dumpsite. The factor that necessitated the study was the migration (under the directive of the government of the state) of all auto mechanics, spare parts dealers and similar professions from the city to the region of the site chosen for this study. The high influx of these types of businesses to this area and the attendant effect their activities will have on the environment led to the carrying out of this study. • The site is the major scrap metal dumpsite in Benin City. More details has been given in the revised manuscript • The sampling was done between January and April which is considered as dry season in Nigeria and samples for analysis were collected in triplicate at intervals of 3 m starting from the dumpsite up till 18 m from the dumpsite. More



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- During lab analysis, give the reader an early indication of what heavy metals were analysed and the rationale why you chose them Results and Discussions - Good presentation of results, but very much expected. With such it becomes hard to discuss. But your discussion can be enriched by adding more cross-references from Nigeria or West Africa. What have others found? Conclusion - You have not done studies on corrosion capacity and the soil retention capacity, so you cannot not conclude like this. - Add some recommendation.	details have been given in the revised manuscript. - This has been indicated in the revised manuscript - References from Nigeria and others have been added - The conclusion having to do with corrosion has been removed - Some recommendations have been added
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methods: Adding a map/skept of the study area will help. Results • Make the FEPA comparison clearer. I guess the limits will be for for the top x m of soil not even 2 m of soil below the surface. So please check and be exact on this.	This has been taken care of in the revised manuscript
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Precise, short and well written paper. But assessment studies on heavy metals have to be justified better and have a good discussion, otherwise it sounds not a good addition to the field of study.	Just a quick note: Following some observations by one of the reviewers, we have gone back to look at our results and discovered some inconsistencies with the graphs that were initially plotted. In order to correct these errors in plotting, we have completely plotted all the graphs again.