



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	(1) There was no introductory/leading statement in the abstract before reporting the findings. The four paragraphs of a standard abstract should contain the Introduction, Methodology, Results/Findings, and Conclusion/Recommendation in that order. The author(s) did not observe this order. (2) The journal format did not permit unnecessary fragmentation of sections like statements of the problem, aim and objectives, justification of the research. These are supposed to be captured under INTRODUCTION, not as separate sub-sectional headings again	(1). Yes an introduction and methodology has been included/added in the abstract. The order of: Introduction, Methodology, Results/Findings, and Conclusion/Recommendation are now followed. (2). The corrections are made. Fragmentation of sections like statements of the problem, aim and objectives, justification of the research are now removed and all captured under INTRODUCTION.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 71: i disagree with the phrase 'no study in the past'. There are arguably few past studies. The author(s) work is not the absolute first! It could have been something like 'Scanty literature reported.....'	I agree with your position and the corrections are now made. It was good you pointed it out.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1) Kindly re-check for general typographical and grammatical errors. For instance, (a) in line 40 'environmental experts' would have been more preferable to 'environmental observers'; (b) line 44: 'which result'; (c) line 63: check the phrase again 'information on the quality as suitability?'; (d) lines 108-116 are in verbatim duplicated between 121-127? (2) The plots of findings on Piper, Durov and Scholler diagrams as mentioned in lines 11 and 12 were never clearly shown on any Figure in the manuscript	(1). Please Re-check, in line 40, it was to 'environmental observers' that was used and that was what you are advocating. I never used 'environmental experts' as you observed Sir. Line-44, 'which result'; now corrected. Line-63, information on the quality as suitability' Thank you for the observation, it was an omission but it has now been corrected. Lines-108-116 versus Lines 121-127. The verbatim duplication has been corrected. No more repetition now, you can check the corrected version. (2). The plot of Piper diagram has been added in the paper as figure 2.
--	--	---