



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_7694
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metals Concentration at Electronic-Waste Dismantling Sites and Dumpsites in Lagos, 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	<p>Comments on the style of reporting are made on the manuscript. For example, it is important to touch on the comments made on the significance of this study.</p> <p>The results should be reported as a standard deviation. This has been stated in the manuscript.</p> <p>The discussion should be discussed correlating some factors about the study areas. For instance, the high level of a particular metal should be discussed as a possibility of the presence of some products, like batteries are known to be produced from batteries</p> <p>The discussion has made the conclusion to be scanty.</p> <p>The introduction should be re-written. It is rich with good references but its incoherent.</p> <p>A better description of the study area, possibly with maps gives an international reader a better view of the research.</p> <p>There are so many grammatical errors noticed. Some have been pointed out in the reviewers comments on the manuscript.</p>	<p>Corrections effected.</p> <p>Observation was noted and effeted.</p> <p>To my best of knowledge, discussion is always robust while conclusion is just like summary and should be brief.</p> <p>More information about the study area has been added including a map.</p> <p>All grammatical errors have been corrected.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Figures, space then units eg 2 mm not 2mm	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>It's a good and novel venture, most especially for a developing country like Nigeria.</p> <p>The article lacks some scientific format/ standards of reporting. Some of these are highlighted in the manuscript as reviewers comments</p>	<p>All the suggestions have been addressed.</p>