



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
1. The subject examined in this article is important in terms of environmental pollution. However, the presentation of the data is some confused and not very understandable in English.	
2. Referees emphasized on the restructuring of the results and discussion sections, but there was no important change in the discussion section except that only a few words were deleted. Therefore, the discussion part needs to be regulated especially for its English.	The discussion section has been regulated as suggested.
3. In the Results section, tables should be given after the description of each table and the word Table should start with a capital letter (not table 1)	Corrected
4. While the Latin name is given throughout the article, the genus and species names should be clearly written in the first use (eg <i>Celosia argentea</i>) and then it should give shortly (<i>C. argentea</i>)	Corrected
5. One of the referee proposals stated that the dumpsite and map given in the article were mixed, but no correction was made. It is important to increase the readability of the map.	The referee was requesting for proper labelling of the figure as figures deleted from introduction was bearing the same figure labelling with the map. Those figures in introduction were deleted as suggested by another referee.
6. The third sentence of the introduction can be given at first, because a paragraph starting with heavy metals may be more appropriate for the subject of the article.	
7. The second sentence of the summary should be reconsidered.	Corrected
8. My opinion is that the article can be accepted after making these corrections.	I can't understand the summary the editor refers to: either the abstract or significant statement.