



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAERI_17855
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Heavy Metal Concentration and Fractionation in Selected Dumpsite Soils within Ibadan Metropolis, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 50-51, please revise "Detail about soil origin..." as the sentence is dangling and doesn't make sens. Check the grammar in the subsequent lines. Please indicate what is the significance of the study especially for the readers who would be reading the article in the journal.. What can people gain from the study? Where exactly are the different locations when the authors indicated that they purposively sampled? Was the debris on the surface removed prior to the soil collection? What is the volume of the soil obtained or weight of the soil samples obtained? Only 1 composite sample for the entire location? What do the authors mean by representative samples were air dried? How many representative samples were obtained from the composite sample? What do you mean by analar grade?? Is this the same as indicating Analytical Grade? Please elaborate regarding the procedures of the routine soil analysis. Readers may want to know what you did and replicate the procedure rather than stating what is indicated in lines84-85. Were there appropriate standards and controls used? If yes, then please indicate in the manuscript. Only measures of central tendency were used in the analysis? No other statistical analysis employed? Maybe the authors would want to see whether significant differneces in the soil quality is evident in the 2 different sources of pollution. A t test can probably be performed. This	They locations were purposively sampled so as to show the picture of various metal pollution sources even though they are all dumpsite. Soil sample for each of the locations were taken at different points to make them representatives and bulk together per location to form a composite sample for each location. I meant to write analytical grade please? The procedure for soil analysis T-test value has been provided. Thanks.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	result can be more meaningful rather than seeing only the measures of central tendency. If authors would want to do the significant differences please make sure that you must indicate in the manuscript the level of significance and indicate whether normality was attained and the measures did to assure normality was attained. There are some portions in lines 81-87 that is redundant to those as indicated in lines 93-105. Authors may want to elaborate the procedure in the part of lines 81-87 and do not put the last sentence and in lines 93-105, the paragraph can stay as is. Please present the mean $\pm$ SD values in the manuscript. I do not know what the values are. Are they the mean values or just the raw values. Line 217-218 should not be indicated because the study did not show this in their result. The result only showed descriptives by indicating only the mean and no correlation was done. Literatures supporting the discussion should only focus on what the results are. If authors want to put this as part of their discussion then, the paper has to show more statistical analysis. Only use literatures supporting the results of the authors. Please put a source for the line 300-302.	The mean and standard deviation for those metal values in each soil sample at each location should be ok for the data analysis. There are standards that can be considered to check with that will indicate the levels of pollution by each of the metals. For procedure , writing all the methods involved will take more space but will summarise so that at least readers swill be able to understand the procedure. Line 217-218 has been removed. the values are mean values and their standard deviation
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 35, revise inurbancenters to in urban centers Line 61 again revise the word atdetermining to at determining... Line 68 again, please revise Line 81 please revise, similar comment as indicated above.. Line 115 please revise. Line 93 revise. Line 127 revise, 129 revise. Lines 181 revise. Line 193 revise. Lines 254 revise. Line 305 revise. Lines 307 revise. Line 318 revise. What do you mean by cub in line 319?	All necessary correction had been done here. The word cu in line 319 has been replace with prevent
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There were some literatures used in the discussion that is not supported by the results of the authors. If no correlations were made in the study, studies pertaining to the relationships of one parameter to another should not be indicated. The usual practice is only to get literatures that support the results of the study and not get literatures in which the study did not do. Generally, the paper is descriptive. No comparisons were made in the 2 dumpsites obtained. I wonder what was the purpose of having 2 dumpsites in the study if they will not be compared even for differences. The study did not use a control group which is an area that is not contaminated with the dumpsite. If the intention is to go about a comparison of the 2 dumpsites, then, appropriate statistical analysis should be indicated in the manuscript. It would be more meaningful if more statistical analyses is used rather than giving the readers with descriptive measures.	I have deleted those literatures on correlations, thanks I have used T-test as indicate please. To compare the 2 dumpsites.