



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Review & Research International</u>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_PRRI_4020
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of the As, Cd, Mn and Hg Contamination in Soils and Plants (<i>Amaranthus Spinosis</i>) 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	This sentence requires revision,The organic matter in the dumpsite soils during the wet season were Generally lower compared to the dry. (Abstract line 14and15) So is this sentence line 22, 23. The study evidently indicates high level of the selected heavy metals in the dumpsites, this calls for environmental concern Since these dumpsites are invariably used as organic manures for farming. It's too long and confusing. Line 61, this phrase 'poor farmers' maybe rephrased by Low income earning farmers, Line 63, 64, 65, This however, lead to accumulation of heavy metals in plants grown on dumpsite soils or fertilized from such manure which on subsequent transfer through food chain end up in man, posing potential health risk. <i>Is this a hypothesis or it was found previously if so then referencing is necessary.</i> Line 71 and 72. <i>The significant of this work would to be provide recent and additional information relevant for soil quality monitoring and assessment of the human health and ecological implications</i>	Now addressed. Now addressed Now addressed Now addressed It is now recast



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>associated with refuse dumpsites. This sentence requires revision it's not sounding good.</i> <i>References should be current in introduction maybe 10 years old.</i> <i>Table1 needs revision.</i> <i>Which statistical tool was used, I cannot find where it is mentioned.</i>	Now addressed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<i>It may be necessary to rewrite the introduction it's too long and general the problem was not put forward properly. Accessions should be backed with literature or else it becomes an accusation. The introduction is full of accusations.</i> References are too old throughout the study.	Now addressed Now addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<i>The study addresses a necessary field and matches the scope of the journal and the article can be published after carefully revision. Authors should refrain from communicating their minds in introduction unless backed with previous studies.</i>	Noted