SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Physical Review & Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2013_PRRI_4020**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An Evaluation of the As, Cd, Mn and Hg Contamination in Soils and Plants (*Amaranthus Spinusis)* of Kaduna Metropolis Dumpsites**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	My review for this publication is: This research paper covers a very important area of environmental pollution. However, the study lacks some very important information before it could be considered for publication. The study contains only one time measurements of wet season and dry season. Information on rainfall, size of dump sites, international soil classification, what type of crops are grown in the area and by farmers, why this particular test crop was selected, and what common name of the crop is, etc is missing. There is this one not very scientific term, "Transfer Factor" used in the text. What this term signifies and what units it has and how this absorption of toxic ions is not explained in terms of CEC (what these units of Cmol/kg for CEC mean), how measurements of electrical conductivity help Transfer factor/absorption, organic matter and water content values are expressed on oven dry basis or what. It would be nice to get trend of toxic ions absorption as a function of time (means more than one year data). The study has a limited scope of application and it should be widened. I also agree with whatever comments the previous	

	reviewer has made. I would suggest a major revision of this publication in light of comments I have made. Then consider it for specific comments and suggestions.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer