



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12324
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Heavy Metals in Soils from Municipal Solid Waste Land Fill
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	1. Please have the names of authors, their affiliation, source(s) of funding source(s) and conflict of interest (if any_. 2. The article would benefit greatly if reviewed and edited by a native English speaker or somebody in the Department of English at a local college or university. It suffers from a 'suboptimal' style of writing. The authors convey their thoughts but in rather clumsy sentences at several places. 3. In the Results section (Section 3.1) lines 130-134 (that start with 'The heavy metal concentrations.....') are redundant. The same information is presented in Table 2 as well. So please remove lines 130-134.	Names of authors and affiliations are declared in the submission form. Once more it is attached here in. Authors are J.C. Ifemeje, S.C. Udedi, C.B. Lukong, A.U. Okechukwu, C. Egbuna and no external source of funds. Reviewed. Noted and edited. Noted and removed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Based on what is mentioned in the footnote to Table 2 do all the metals have a statistically significant difference in their concentrations between the two sites? This is a bit confusing.	No manipulations and that's our original findings.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. In the title of Table 3 please remove the word 'heavy'. It really does not convey anything. 3. What is the exact significance of finding a high or low correlation between certain metals and PAH concentrations? The authors just reiterate what they see in Table 4 in the Discussion but do not mention what this means. The health effects of PAHs or heavy metals individually are understandable. But what does the correlation mean?	“heavy” removed, Thank you. This sentence in the manuscript justified the question. “The correlation study of high molecular weight PAHs and heavy metals from the study sites revealed that there is a significant positive correlation among the heavy metals Pb, Cd, and Cu and among the HMW PAHs Bbf, Chy, Ind and Dah at $P < 0.01$ level indicating that a positive linear relationship existed among the heavy metals and among the HMW PAHs suggesting that the source of the heavy metals and HMW PAHs may be the same and could be attributed to waste dump due to human activities.”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Comment: Also its little surprising that MOST metals and PAHs have a good correlation (0.8 and above) Accept after revision	The result of the correlation is based on our findings.