



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5733
Title of the Manuscript:	Markers of Environmental Health: Nickel and Chromium Levels in Soil and Vegetation around a Steel Recycling Facility in Southwest Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	1. See the corrections on the actual manuscript highlighted in yellow and blue. Item recommended for deletion are in Red with double strikethrough.	The comment was noted and appropriate corrections have been effected.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Under Introduction, Author should include the exposure limit of chromium and nickel in soil and plant tissue to strengthen the need for this research. 2. Under Materials and Methods (add s to Material) Materials. Also include location E as the control from pristine site 3. Under line 88 delete as shown from ~~te~~ time to time 4. Under results and Discussions just before 3.1 Soil parameters delete lines 99-101 5. Line 106: Provide reference for the statement: "This is typical of most African soils" or delete it. 6. Line 121, add the last name of the lead Author before the reference number than those reported by Akpoveta [13] or ...than those that have been reported [13]. 7. Same for line 139 add the authors' names before	1. Effected as suggested. 2. The corrections have been made. 3. Deleted as suggested. 4. Deleted as suggested 5. Reference has been included. 6. Corrected as suggested. 7. Corrected as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	references ...the observations of Cartwright and Al-Khashman [16-17] and not ...the observation of [16, 17] 8. Line 140: Tables 3 & 4: Explain the anomaly with Chromium levels in the samples from the East site were increasing as distance increased Cr at 50m (nd) < 100 m (2.29) < 150m (21.9 < 200 m (22.48) < 250m (33.26), clearly, the Cr concentration in the soil increases with distance until at 300m and 350m. Thus the data may not be in agreement with those reported in reference 16 & 17. Similarly, for the Nickel levels from the samples collected from the North side of the factory increased with distance., The concentration at 350m was higher than those at 50-300m definitely there are anomalies for Nickel going from 50m to 100m to 150m then 250m to 300m and to 350m. There is an increase as distance increases between these points. 9. Line 195: Add Author's name before the reference number ...similar to those reported by Fagbote [20]	8. It was not an anomaly that the concentrations of both metals first increased with increasing distance from the factory. This is probably because the air-borne metal particles in the fumes emitted from the furnaces were carried and deposited on the soils closer the factory than farther away. However, higher concentrations were observed where the direction of the wind was prevalent during the period of the study i.e. in the northern and eastern side of the fenced recycling facility. 9. Corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		