



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10216
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy metals assessment in vegetables irrigated with urban water: A case study in District Sargodha
Type of the 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	In MATERIALS and METHODS and specifically in the issue Collection of samples, I think it is necessary to detail the sample size and number used in the experiment. Also, spinach and radish are two distinct vegetables, whose edible portion is different, so the sampling description in each crop should be clear and precise. RESULTS This issue must be reviewed carefully because: ❖ The tables 1 and 3 are not mentioned in the text. ❖ In the tables 2 and 3 appear the results of factorial analysis and I consider this statistical analysis is not right in this case, since each crop should be analysed separately and not by factorial method. On the other hand, I hope that the tables show Error mean square, i.e., the variance and not Mean square as appears in these tables. ❖ There are numerous mistakes in signalling the table numbers that are included in the manuscript. ❖ The authors say: "Cadmium concentration was indicated high in radish from samples collected from Istaqlalabad" and in the table 6 appears the highest value from samples collected in Silanwali. ❖ The ranges of cadmium concentration described in the text have measure units different from those included in the tables. For example, in the	Three replicates of soil samples, water and vegetables were collected from different sites. Soil samples were collected from 0-30 cm depth. Leaves of spinach and roots of radish were collected from the sites where soil samples were collected. Three samples were collected from each site. All the tables have been mentioned in the text. Typographical mistakes has been incorporated Typographical mistakes has been incorporated Zn concentration has been mentioned in wastewater, contaminated soil and in vegetables.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	case of soil appears mg/g while µg/g appears in the table 5. ❖ In the text, the authors do not comment about Zn concentration in wastewater, contaminated soil and vegetables. DISCUSSION Owing to the heavy metal uptake by vegetables is affected by different factors among them, plant species and physicochemical characteristics of soil, these aspects should be deeply discussed, since the results showed that the experimental sites have characteristics very different. It is necessary to discuss some aspects, for example, why does cadmium concentration from non-contaminated soil in Silanwali is higher than those from soil contaminated in Kot Freed and Istaqlalabad?. Also, two different species were studied.	In result the cadmium is higher in contaminated soil of Silanwali sites may be due to waste water Typographical mistake has been incorporated Zn concentration has been mentioned in the text
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I consider that heavy metals and wastewater may be included as Key words. In the manuscript appears RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS, however results are only described in this issue; so these are RESULTS. The titles of the tables should be reviewed. In the tables 4, 5 and 6, the names of the sites must be written correctly. In the literature cited, I suggest to include more references from the last five years, since four cites were only included.	These key words have been incorporated in the manuscript Correct names of sites has been incorporated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If any ethical issue, please clarify	