



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_7160
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydrogeochemistry and statistical analysis of the Benin Formation in parts of Eastern Niger Delta, Nigeria
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	From the paper "The study identified salt intrusion, high iron content, acid rain, hydrocarbon pollution, use of agrochemicals, industrial effluents and poor sanitation as contributors to the soil and water deterioration in the area" – Comment: Where???...The contribution does not show any map or graph showing how these problems (ecotoxic heavy metals , hydrocarbon, etc) are display in the study area...can they develop any figure/s or chart/s showing the most critical values or parameters in cases like Pb, Cr, As, Hg, etc ...and where they are geographically located... <u>The contribution lacks a general table with the raw data.</u>	We think that the groundwater vulnerability map developed (Figure 3) display the general pollution trend in the study area. We are not favourably disposed to show their geographical locations and names of the localities even though we have them, due to the sensitive nature of the study area and we do not want to do what could lead to crisis between the oil companies and their host communities. However, plates 1-3 was added to display the poor environmental situation in the study area in terms of oil spills, gas flaring and dumpsite but we cannot not state the specific location for same reason stated above. The raw data can be hijacked if imputed raw. Considering the high cost of chemical and bacteriological analyses, it is safe for us to subject the raw data to statistical analysis and discuss statistically as shown in Tables 1-3. Modern scientific writing encourages statistical evaluation of data and that is what we did.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The contribution is very interesting and clear considering the risk evaluation....but lacks a complete data base to support the findings.	Thank you for saying The contribution is very interesting and clear considering the risk evaluation, we have the complete data base to support the findings but cannot show all due to security reasons Sir/Ma.