



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_9359
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF ROADSIDE DUST FOR HEAVY METAL POLLUTANTS IN JIMETA/YOLA ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The methodology is faulty: there is no description of the sampling locations viz a viz the traffic density and other mention of industrial activities. There was no mention of Quality Control procedures. 2. Tables (1&2) for results are too shallow. There should be determination of enrichment factor to be sure the introduction of metals into the road dust is anthropogenic. 3. There should be Test of Normality to determine if ANOVA is appropriate because most geochemical parameters are usually Non-normal. 4. Metals should be correlated to determine their relationships in the road dust 5. Credible discussion cannot be undertaken because of the amount of tables presented. Tables should be improved. 6. Conclusion cannot be supported with the results because traffic density of studied locations are not reported. 7. There are grammatical mistakes.	1.Traffic density has been improved upon. 2.The research work is on analysis of roadside dust for heavy metal and the values on the table is very clear and convincing. 3. No need of normality test since standard procedures were followed and calibration curve for each of the metals were obtained. 4.metals did not originate from the same source 5.Noted 6. Refer to the study area. 8. Noted.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript should be overhauled generally and re-reviewed before acceptance.	
---	--	--