



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Some important work done in the manuscript is not reflected in the abstract. i.e. the statistical part using the PV, yet this is very important. Methodology: Statistics part is not shown in the methodology. This should be shown. Correlation and level of significance is mentioned but it's not shown how it was obtained. Improve the discussion: especially in line 251-267. There's no flow of information. This is not a discussion	Noted Noted Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Suggests that results be separated from discussion.	The guideline to authors would be adhered to.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper seems to be too shallow/ short: get more information from literature	Noted