



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2192
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF HEAVY METALS ON MICROBIAL FUNCTION IN WATER AND SEDIMENT AROUND ABONNEMA ISLAND AT LOWER SOMBRIERO RIVER, NIGERIA

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The manuscript has been somewhat improved but there are still uncorrected parts of several sections of the paper. Presentation of the data obtained in certain fragments of the text is too detailed and extensive, and hence not enough clear. The section Results and Discussion should be reconstructed and shortened. There are still too numerous Figures attached. There are still incorrectly expressed units, e.g. "ppm" (P.12, subsections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3), "cm³" together with "ml" (P.8, subsection 2.5.1). Moreover, the authors use "KH₂ PO₄" instead of "KH₂PO₄" or "Pb (NO₃)₂" instead of "Pb(NO₃)₂" (P.8-P.9), etc. The authors unclearly note that "Statistical analysis showed significant difference (P = 0.05) between..." (P.12, subsection 3.2.2) whilst in the next subsection 3.2.3 they write that "no significant difference (P = 0.05) between...". It is evident contradiction! At the same significance level (P = 0.05) there is impossible to have significant or insignificant relationship. The authors' interpretation of correlation coefficients in many places of the text is also controversial, for instance on P. 13 (section 3.3.) is: "No significant difference (P = 0.05) with positive correlation (0.0527)" and in the next sentence is written "no significant difference (P = 0.05) with very high positive correlation (0.7061)". It is nonsense. What is reason for that the authors discriminate correlation coefficients as "positive or very high positive correlation" at the same significance level. In other parts of the text the authors extensively interpret correlation data obtained also at the same level (P = 0.05) as significant or insignificant. It is nonsense. A measure of statistical significance of relationship between considered variables is exclusively the level of significance (e.g. P<0.05, P<0.01, P<0.001) but not correlation or discrimination coefficient (R or R²).	Details are given for clarity and better explanation The figures make the results clearer The suggested corrections have been effected The observed contradictions here and elsewhere have been corrected, they were reported as was in excel The level of significance used was P> or <0.05 however an instruction of the journal required P=0.05 instead of P<0.05 Also correlation coefficients + or - are reported positive or negative respectively and <0.5 as low or very low and >0.5 as high or very high