



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_14261
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>GEOCHEMICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOIL WITHIN A DUMPSITE IN SAGAMU SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 2 not completed especially for the right side scale. (??)</li> <li>The soils generally can be classified as sandy clay or silts?? Please refer to your Table 1. Table 1 shows that your samples from 5 locations made up of (56-60% Silt; 29-33% Sand).</li> <li>References** Some of cited papers in the text body are missing at references (page 8 and 9). Please check again all of them. Example: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Praveena et al., 2007</li> <li>Praveena et al., 2008</li> <li>Sutherland, 2000</li> <li>Chakravarty and Patgiri, 2009</li> <li>Muller, 1969</li> <li>Kumar and Edward, 2009</li> <li>etc.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I have tried to adjust the Figure appropriately.</li> <li>I agreed with the reviewer. The soil has been reclassified as silty sand since silt has the largest percentage.</li> <li>The references have been corrected appropriately.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
ethical issues in this manuscript	** Many papers are not cited properly, then missing in the references section.	