



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"> Title: The title of the manuscript is quite misleading. Authors should modify the title to reflect the fact that the study sought to investigate the variation of selected soil chemical properties along landscape position Abstract: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The length of the abstract is too long and should be reduced to at most 250 words. The abstract should be revised since it is supposed to give a summary of the whole study AND NOT ONLY the results of the study Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This should not only be limited to lead pollution alone. Authors should also talk about relation between landscape position and soil properties as well. Authors should modify the aim and justification of the study. What is stated is quite misleading Materials and Methods <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Under section 2.1, a map showing the specific location of the study site should be provided Under section 2.2, authors should state clearly the method of sampling (whether the method of Brubaker et al, 1993). They should also indicate how much soil sample was collected from each sampling point 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>5. <u>Results and Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The authors should provide clearer tables. They can refer to Babalola <i>et al</i> (2007), available at www.medwelljournals.comb. Authors should define all abbreviations in tables <p>6. <u>Conclusion:</u> Authors should ssssrevise the conclusion section since it is supposed to give a brief summary of the findings and recommendations from the study</p> <p>7. <u>References:</u> Authors should stick to the standard method of referencing. This will make the manuscript more presentable. They should also provide the reference for citation 32</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the key words section, leaching, hydromorphic, floodplain and marginal fertility should be deleted. Instead landscape (slope) position, heavy metals and soil nutrients (or fertility) should be added.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I wish to commend the authors for their effort. The paper would certainly be a useful reference material for researchers, land use planners and farmers. Therefore I would urge the authors to thoroughly revise the manuscript paying attention to the points raised above.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer