



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 (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	My commentaries related with the manuscript format and itself are as follows: -The authors must review the author's guidelines regarding to the length of the abstract and some analysis done by the authors noted in the abstract didn't mention in the methodology's section, please, check it. -The introduction is enough and concise to give the background of the work to the readers. -Regarding to the Methodology's section, I suggest the authors: Eliminate Figure 1, it is not necessary to show the characteristics of the site. I suggest the authors review the subtitles inside this section, the format of subtitles must be uniform and some of them are not adequate, for example, "Study area" could be joined with "Heavy metal analysis", this section could be: "Analysis of the heavy metal content in soil and vegetable samples". -	We would check the guidelines and the abstract again. Figure 1 would be eliminated as suggested. The suggestions on subtitles are noted. The unit of volume has been noted and corrected to mL



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-The authors must review the author's guidelines, regarding to the use of units, they noted volume units as "cm³" instead of "mL", please, check all of them. -The authors must note in the methodology's lsection, which were the vegetable harvested from the farm samples, please, check it. - The authors didn't mention in the determination of heavy metals content in vegetables, if the metals analyzed from this samples were the same as in soil samples (Pb, Cu, Cr, Ni, Zn, Fe, Cd and Mn) please, check it. - I suggest the authors, carefully review this section of materials and methods, they didn't note all the physicochemical analysis that they did to the soil samples, they only mention in this section two of them: pH and organic matter determination. The others like cation exchange capacity, electrical conductivity, total nitrogen content, exchangeable Na, K, Mg and Ca, available P, didn't appear, please, check it. - The authors must note also in this section the statistic methods that they employ to analyze their results, they didn't mention about it, please, check it.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The authors mention in their results something about the Enrichment Factor (EF), what means the authors with this term, again they didn't mention this calculation in the methodology's section, please, check it. <i>-Regarding to the Results and Discussion section:</i> <i>I didn't made a detailed review of this section of the manuscript because this is not clear, the authors present a lot of results, important results but in a very confused way that is not related to the methodology that they employed.</i> <i>I suggest the authors review this section and the discussion of their results, and present it in a better way.</i> <i>The authors must check the author's guidelines for their references; specially regarding to the presentation of the references in the reference's list, because the names of some journals are noted with their abbreviations and others appear with their complete names, please, check them.</i>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript entitled: <i>“Heavy metal concentrations in some vegetables grown in a farm treated with urban solid waste in Kuru Jantar, Jos South, and Plateau State”</i>, try to analyze the uptake of heavy metals by selected vegetables that grown on a farm treated with urban solid wastes. The authors presented the manuscript in a confuse presentation, regarding to the methodology and results and discussion sections, and in my personal opinion I suggest the authors make some important corrections to the manuscript.	The comments of the reviewer have been noted but we wished he had given example of the confused presentation