



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_5742
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF LEAD (HEAVY METAL) POLLUTANT ON SOIL FERTILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF INLAND VALLEYS OF ISHIAGU, SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is not clearly matching well with the topic because statements included as not presented to show or based on effects of lead/heavy metal pollution as stated in the topic. The author presents the abstract as if it was a general soil characterization. Therefore it needs to be reorganized. 2. Line -34 reference is needed. 3. Line 77- names of areas where the study was done should be included. 4. Line 108- Is the soil pH measured in water or KCl, the author needs to write clearly on this. 5. The author needs to explain literature backing why he/she with thinks for pH to decrease with slope position all centrally to all other literally cited in the same paragraph. 6. I find the way the author has presented this paper a little bit hazy or muddled in the sense that it does not clearly show a control. This is as to how could they attribute any changes/differences they could have observed to the said lead/heavy metal pollution. The author only compares the results with standard critical values as presented by Landon (1991) and others but not a control site. I think results could have been compared with another site(s) with the same soil type and similar characteristics but 	<p>The abstract has been re-casted to address this issues as contained in the corrected manuscript.</p> <p>Names of the areas where the study was done have been addressed or included in the corrected copy of the manuscript. Line 108 has been addressed as contained in the corrected manuscript. Explanations with literature have been given in the corrected manuscript to explain the pH trends.</p> <p>The lowlands of the studied area which are</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not under mining activities to show the effects of the pollution being talked about in the paper	our targeted areas for the study are in one way or the other linked to one or more mining pits by linking streams or water ways. Therefore, the issue of selecting a control site, that is, without link to any mining pits may be difficult. This is why we decide to compare the results with a standard set critical values presented by Landon (1990) and others that is widely accepted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 231-232. The statement is too speculative and may consider to use 'may be' instead of 'is'	Noted and corrected accordingly
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		