



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4500
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METAL POLLUTION OF IN-SITU AND SURROUNDING SOILS PROFILES AT MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE DUMPSITE

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In the abstract please use for Atomic Absorption Spectrometer (AAS) The abstract is informative and follows the trend of usual abstracts methodology so no comments on it, Keywords is well chosen. Introduction: 1. looking at ref [10] please check reference 10 so you need to check the web site and mention the access 2. Plate.1 Picture needs to be clear with little comments 3. In general; the introduction that contains the literature review is very good and accepted to be in its final form as it is dramatically changed after revision. 2.3 Assessment of heavy metal (HM) Contamination in Soil Profile 1. Statistical analysis of data of samples for means, variance, coefficient of variation and correlation coefficient utilized the Words' SPSS software, version 17 windows. Vertical penetration of profile by pollution is defined by ratio I suggest to be Statistical analysis of data of samples for means, variance, coefficient of variation and correlation coefficient utilized using' SPSS software, version 17. Vertical penetration of profile by pollution is defined by ratio..... 2. For the author, kindly check your chi Square to evaluate yours table and this available in SPSS 3. It is interesting to evaluate Cu and Mn (in table 1) as they are high but I guess it is beyond the scope of this paper. 4. Please check the mean of Bo in the table 1 again 5. Table 2. The t-values: I suggest to change it to t-test or distribution values 6. Wondering for table 2 if logistic regression could present a better value..... it is an idea for a different paper so forget it 3.2 Correlations 1. Good evaluation of the correlation and nice to see table 3 to present pearson correlation. But usually there is a little writeup about literatures here. 3.4 Contamination Factor (CF) 1. Figure 2 shows the graphswith HM toxicity please note if you try to plot CS on the secondary axis you will notice the difference 3.5 Heavy Metal Pollution Index (HPI) and crop production For the author please notice that you are mentioning a pH in your literature while you are not evaluating the full chemical composition including the pH and conductivity so please remove this literature to avoid any confusion.	Abstract: Line 22. Abbreviation AAS adopted (Atomic Absorption Spectrometer changed). Introduction: Line 77. NPS defined as nonpoint source. Line 80. The website and access date were added. Line 119. Former Plate 1 is replaced with more recent and clearer picture with comments on site layout (X1, X2, X3 and X4) Introduction: I appreciate your remarks. 2.2 Sampling and analysis:Line 174. The other 3 metals (Al, B and Cr) were added. 2.3 Assessment of (HM) contamination in soil profile: Line 215 – 220. Comment 1: The suggested framing of sentence is accepted and made use of (see text). Comments 5, 6: Line 231. MN to Mn; Ar to Al; Bo to B. Line 234: Bo to B. Line 237: Boron to B. Comment 3: Evaluating high value of Cu and Mn: this is incorporated in recommendations. Comment 4: Line 254 (bottom low Table 1): Mean of B corrected to 0.096 (or 0.10). Comment 5: Line 298 (Table 2 title): This was changed as reviewed to read: "The t-test values for significant difference in HM.....urban dumpsite, Nigeria" Comment 6: Noted. Comment 3.2: Thank you for your delight. Line 436: Bo to B. Line 439: Ar to Al. Comment 3.3. Nil. Comment 3.4: Secondary axis. The range of maximum to minimum values was too wide, so I chose to add insert magnifying the very low values of Cr, Cd and B. Comment 3.5 432 was modifiedaccordingly (see text).



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

4.0 Conclusion

Even *linear correlation coefficient is marking higher values* but still analysis could suggest contamination exists. There is a chance to find further recommendation from the body of the text to suggest recommendations as its embedded within the whole writeup.

5.0 REFERENCES

On the reference please mention <http://www.jofamericanscience.org/journals/am-sci/am0612/> (access date)

4.0 Conclusion

Line 447. Correlation coefficient was changed to “covariance” which was intended.
 Line 451- 453: The green highlight was contracted and made precise; and the confusing phrase (Cu, Mn, Ni, Fe and Bo) deleted.

5.0 References

Line 475. This was added. Access date was also added.
 New reference 26 added, former 27, 28 renumbered. Former 29 deleted.