



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14779
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metal Concentrations in Some Vegetables Grown in a Farm Treated With Urban Solid Waste in Kuru Jantar, Jos South, and Plateau State
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Rewrite the results, some values write in result but not found in the table. Research work is good but not write properly.	We wish the reviewer had given an example of values in the write up but not in the table. To say we should rewrite the results is not clear. Does he mean we should rewrite the discussion? However, we would look at the discussion again.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		