



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2015_IRJPAC_16340
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution and Potential Mobility Assessment of Some Hazardous Metals in Soil of Mechanic Workshops: A case study of Akoko land in 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	- Page 1, line 23 has a syntax error (left over words) - Very long sentences; cut in two or rework. - Page 1, line 23; what are "plying automobiles"? - Page 2, line 40: poor choice of words: "More disturbing is that,..." - Page 2, line 44: start transitioning lead, cadmium, nickel, manganese to Pb, Cd, Ni, Mn..... - Page 2, line 44: great example of a way to long sentence" Systems in which toxic...."; cut it into two. - I feel Page 2, line 44 is also missing a reference as to where that info came from. - Page 2; line 67: In recent times, some studies + could be better started like this "Other studies...." - Very long sentences throughout MS. The writing is good but, long sentences tend to lose the effect of the message on the reader. - Page 3, line 91: would be better like this: The focus of this study is to investigate..... - Do not like latitudes and longitudes; refer to a figure (i.e. a map) otherwise the coordinates are not much help. - Tell the reader what CH₃CHOONH₄ is before using the chemical formula. - Page 5, line 142: isn't it Uzairu and Harrison et al. (2009)? - Page 5 has a table but no Table # or caption; fix. - Renumber the other tables after you put the table on page 5 with a number. - Page 7 has one huge paragraph however, I see at least 3 separate paragraphs in it. - Same goes for page 10 and maybe for Cadmium. - Page 16, conclusion: first sentence seems like a method, not a	- Updated - Done - Plying automobiles are cars, motor cycles, buses, lorries etc - Updated - Done - Done - Updated - Corrected - Updated - Updated - They are now removed - Ammonium ethanoate - it is Uzairu et al. (2009) - Table 1A - Noted - Done - Done - Updated Conclusion I have updated the conclusion, in terms of mobility and bioavailability; we actually mean mobility and possible bioavailability,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conclusion. A conclusion goes over what you found in a narrative fashion with larger ideas. One huge issue is that <u>mobility and bioavailability</u> are different functions. Just because something is mobile does not mean it is bioavailable for an organism to uptake by a plant or an animal. I think <u>mobility and bioavailability</u> needs to be properly worked out in this manuscript so that the author's show they understand the two different functions and that the reader isn't confused with two different functions as being interchangeable.	because we believe it's what is mobile that can be bioavailable.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	An English editor needs to help the authors polish the minor syntax problems found in this manuscript.	We are grateful for the observation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		