



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7946
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METALS IN EDIBLE CLAYS SOLD IN ONITSHA METROPOLIS OF ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA
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	In the line <u>102</u> the author mentioned reference, but here he most put number (2) not (According to Abrahams et al (2013)). In the line <u>111</u> Sampling/sample collection. This should be under MATERIALS AND METHOD section. In the line <u>137</u> the author should mention Fig 1 and Fig 2 in the paper main body.	We agreed with the reviewers' comments and corrections have been effected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The lines from 117 to 125 should mention what reference the author follows. In the line <u>299</u> the date 1999 was repeated.	The references have been mentioned and one 1999 deleted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Non	