



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13598
Title of the Manuscript:	Stream Water Quality Assessment for Irrigation at Nasarawa - Kakuri Area of Kaduna, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Short 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)																				
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- Title: Should be revised to read; “Assessment of Water quality for Irrigation in Nasarawa Stream of Kaduna-Nigeria”. 2- Abstract: Shall contain objectives, methods, results and conclusion very briefly described. The author did a very sloppy job. The results does not show that work covered dry and wet periods. So the author should stop speculations. 3- Introduction; ❖ Very inadequate and need through review. ❖ The first four [4] sentences should be transferred under Materials and Methods section. ❖ There are linguistic problems that need urgent fixing. ❖ Objectives are better as opposed to purpose in the last paragraph of this section since conclusions are based on these objectives. 4- Materials and Methods ❖ Very Inadequate and weak ❖ How many samples were taken at each site and for how long? ❖ Were the samples duplicated or triplicate? ❖ The section should briefly capture 1. the study area, Table 1: Location of sample sites and description of activities <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>Code</th> <th>GPS Readings</th> <th>Activity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>S1</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>S2</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>S3</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>S4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	Code	GPS Readings	Activity		S1				S2				S3				S4			The title modification did not modify any keyword. I'm okay with the title, except the editor insists. The work was carried out towards the end of dry season when there will be no dilution from rainfall, contamination level is expected to be highest and irrigation activities are on. This transfer of sentences contradicts your requirement for Abstract in 2 above. It has been taken care of in the Materials and method section. Linguistic problem is not deliberate, though it is part of editing. Those observed have been corrected, but you are at liberty to recast sentences pls. The samples were taken in duplicates, and the values presented are the averages.
Site	Code	GPS Readings	Activity																			
	S1																					
	S2																					
	S3																					
	S4																					



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Water Sampling and chemical analysis, very well and logically described. ❖ Some parameters such as pH, EC etc could be measured directly on site using portable metres. 5- Results and Discussion ❖ Table 1 need to be reorganised as suggested below. Table 2: Mean values of physic-chemical characteristics of water samples from Nasarawa Stream (n=). <table border="1" data-bbox="489 646 1413 922"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th><th>Code</th><th>pH</th><th>EC [μs/cm]</th><th>CO₃⁻ [mg/l]</th><th>HCO₃⁻ [mg/l]</th><th>SO₄⁻ [mg/l]</th><th></th><th></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td>S1</td><td>7.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>S2</td><td>7.7</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>S3</td><td>7.2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>S4</td><td>7.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>FAO, (yr)</td><td>6.5-8.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> EC-Electrical Conductivity; CO₃⁻-Carbonate; HCO₃⁻Bicarbonate; SO₄⁻Sulphate; FAO, (year)-Irrigation and drainage maximum permissible limits of water. ❖ No discussion was done. The author did a very sloppy job. A lot of sentences need to be expunged or otherwise transferred ❖ The section of Sodium Absorption Ratio [Equation] should be transferred to Materials and Methods Section. 6- Conclusions: ❖ Should be reviewed and based on the stated objectives of the study.	Site	Code	pH	EC [μs/cm]	CO ₃ ⁻ [mg/l]	HCO ₃ ⁻ [mg/l]	SO ₄ ⁻ [mg/l]				S1	7.5								S2	7.7								S3	7.2								S4	7.5								FAO, (yr)	6.5-8.5							Table 1 has been reorganized as suggested The objective (or purpose) of the study was already captured in the conclusion, pls read it to the end.
Site	Code	pH	EC [μs/cm]	CO ₃ ⁻ [mg/l]	HCO ₃ ⁻ [mg/l]	SO ₄ ⁻ [mg/l]																																																		
	S1	7.5																																																						
	S2	7.7																																																						
	S3	7.2																																																						
	S4	7.5																																																						
	FAO, (yr)	6.5-8.5																																																						
Minor REVISION comments																																																								
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is substandard and inadequate																																																							