



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAERI_17855
Title of the Manuscript:	Assesment of HeavyMetal 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The work is fine for publication is very interesting. The study is specific and necessary to this region, although there are similar studies for other regions with similar problems, but with different conditions both soil and environmental problems, it is important to attend some corrections, improve drafting and fill in some details. There is a lot of careless presentation, where in different paragraphs there's words together were observed in lines 16, 19, 26, 59 (two cases), 61, 118 (K Ca), 120, 181, 182, 185, 199, 204, 205, 208 212 217 (after the word Available), 310, 315, 318. 2. It would be better to present a map with coordinates showing the sites rather than putting in Table 1 and leaving the other data in Table 1 3. Describe a little more about the geological properties of soils alfisols if present clay,	All of the corrections here had been effected All of these points had been considered. A map with coordinates is now inserted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	organic matter, mainly humic material. 4. In line 40 write better "deposited" instead of turning 5. In the line 45 is better to write "ionic" instead of cationic 6. In line 59 is better to write "organic matter" rather than organically 7. Write in line 83 instead of analar "analytical" 8. In line 87, describe more complete the determination of particle size, for example Bouyoucos technique rather than just to write the reference 13. 9. . Indicate how the organic matter and organic nitrogen was determined 10. Cd measured is not indicated in Table 3, remember when there is Zn there also appears cadmium. 11. In the discussion section is not clear that	The deposited here may not be appropriate. What I was trying to emphasis there is that some of the dumpsite are now cleared and used for farming activities with the knowledge that they must be rich in nutrient elements being a former dumpsite. Done Done Done Done Done Cd was determined initially but was not detected with the instrument when sequential extraction was done.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	having to do the water column regarding soils please improve the wording so that it to better understand what you want to express, 12. At line 201 put the content of organic matter is important because of its relationship with some metals such as copper and if you can how much material humic in the diferent soils. 13. 14. Instead of Table 4 where the results are presented sequential extractions, Could be better to represent each fraction of each sites in a bar graph or pays, if possible for authors	Done. There are values that were not detected by the instrument, so they are better presented in tabular forms than using a bar graph. Thanks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		