



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7051
Title of the Manuscript:	Multivariate statistical analysis and distributional characteristics of heavy metal contamination of soil around Okaba coal mines
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>)

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	This manuscript has potential for publication in British Journal of Applied Science & Technology and should be accepted after serious major revision. I would like to suggest the following: 1. Page 4, line 61 – “Soil sample collection”. This part of the manuscript requires supplement because it isn't contains a lot of relevant information from the point of view of chemical and statistical analysis. Namely, you must provide information on: the size of the area being examined; the number of samples of soils; specify the depth of and the conditions for their collect; the mass of the primary samples and sample; the name of the level or layer of the soil from which the samples; the way the sample averaging overall. In addition, if not to respect, samples are drawn under the structure of the soil, and without that structure. 2. Page 6, line 111 – „Table 1: Okaba soil samples and summary statistics”. Clarification requires Cp values (line 125). Well, this may be theoretical values, the mean of the geochemical background value for each of the elements, and then you must provide the relevant source literature. Or are the values obtained experimentally, and then specify the number of samples received and where these samples were collected? 3. Page 6, line 111 – „Table 1: Okaba soil samples and summary statistics”; page 7, line 128 – “ Table 2: Basic Statistics of measured parameters”. The values contained in the above mentioned tables are given without confidence intervals at the specified level of probability. This should be supplemented. In addition, the lack of information, whether they are average values? The number of designations? How many test samples within one location? There are also units in which concentrations are expressed. 4. Page 6, line 111 – Table 6 and page 10, line 196 – Figs. 4a&b; page 12, line 219 – Table 8 and page 13, line 252 – Figs. 6a&b; page 13, line 253 – Table 9 and page 13, line 271 – Figs. 7a&b. The results presented in the mentioned above Tables and Figures are doubled, and do not bring any additional information. I would suggest delete, or tables, or graphs.	Agree and corrected. Agree and corrected. Agree and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		No, same information but ease of understanding is different. Both tables and figs. to stay.
Minor REVISION comments	5. Page 6, line 108 – „Fig. 2: Sample location map of Okaba”. One of the points on the map hasn't been marked the numbre (above Enjema). This is probably the point OK17, but then you have to check it out. 6. Page 9, line 167 – „Fig. 3: A plot of AF of heavy metals in Okaba soils”. No units on the axis OY 7. Page 7, line 139 – „Table 3: The KMO and Bartlett's tests”; page 9, line 164 – “ Table 5: The anthropogenic factor of heavy metals in Okaba soils”. Some of the record in these Tables are incomprehensible, for example, “ sphericity-08 “(Table 3); “Ni-04.77, Cd-01.58 “(Table 5). Should be, respectively: 8, 4.77, 1.58. 8. Page 6, line 111 – Table 6; Page 12, line 219 – Table 8; page 13, line 253 – Table 9 and page 14, line 298 – Table 10. For what purpose are source from the literature in the titles of these Tables? If the values presented in these Tables aren't the authors of the research results? 9. All Tables The results are presented in Tables with varying accuracy. Within the accuracy of the Table should be the same. In addition, a form of writing some values, for example “.38” (line 124) is not acceptable-should be a 0.38.	Agree and corrected. Agree and corrected. Agree and corrected. Agree and corrected.
Optional/General comments	In my opinion, the research issues is little original, given the fact, that research on heavy metals in the soil are popular for a very many years. Although the work contains certain elements of news (Multivariate Statistical Analysis) doesn't bring a lot of information that could be of particular interest to Reader of British Journal of Applied Science & Technology. Authors should make up part of the analysis and measurement of work and improvement of language.	Disagree, particularly in this part of the world.