



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_46108
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METALS CONCENTRATION IN SWAMPY AGRICULTURAL SOIL OF NASARAWA WEST 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 (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	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authors gave duration of their study as 9 months (between Jan – Oct), which does not correspond to 'one week' of sampling. Does this duration included analysis period? This should not be! Or better still, explain. Authors should crosscheck the abstract and correct it for tenses, grammars and punctuations <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was obviously no review of literatures. Authors should briefly review works on soil, especially those conducted within the area of study (or let the readership know if no study had been conducted), the research gap that their study filled, then the aim and objectives covered by their study. Again authors kept mentioning 'heavy metal' without given instances. Names, occurrence, health impact, etc of the heavy metals, especially those studied should be concisely provided. This will open the purview for your study The order of referencing is inappropriate. It should be sequential. For instance, [3] must come before [4], [5] before [6] in that order. However, after mentioning say [4], you can still have reference of [2] or [1]. In no circumstance will reference [4] appear without first mentioning [3] <p>Method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quality control measures were poor. No blank run in-between samples, no digest blank (if soil samples were digested), no repeatability studies, etc. Authors mentioned that recovery studies were carried out for accuracy check; no data showing the percentage recovery of the elements determined, no information on how it was done or even referencing literature. Authors should provide all these information! Author should provide information of the method of analysis (was it analysed 'as is' or digested) i.e briefly state how the XRF was used, the model of the XRF, manufacturer and country of manufacture Authors should also give the name of reagents used, their 'make' and purity levels <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All units must be separated from the values e.g 10 mg/kg not 10mg/kg. This applies to all other units like mm, cm, etc. Kindly provide the reference for WHO used. Kindly explain the 'PT₁₋₁₀' that appeared in the Figures before using them The discussion should compare other studies in the area 	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 9 month duration includes the sample collection, analysis of sample using XRF spectrometry, and the other technical aspect of the research like review of related work. Collection of sample (soil) from the field took a period of 7 days. The duration include the analysis period. Tenses, grammar, and punctuations have been corrected accordantly. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correction comments were duely observed and effected. <p>Method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sample was not digested during analysis and as such no reagent was use. The analysis procedure is captured in the manuscript. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit's separation- done. WHO reference- done. PT – explained. Other studies comparison- done. Base on our findings, there was no similar study caried in the area.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You mentioned grinded. Kindly use ground or pulverised <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tables look clumsy with the units (mg/kg) appearing severally. A unit could be written to cover all. Again, in Table 2, the use of 'Na' could be confusing as even the legend has different case, 'na'. kindly use 'NA' both in the Table and legend. 	<p>Method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pulverised- Noted. <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comments have been taken care of.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The study was necessary to ascertain the levels of these toxic metals in soils, especially being agricultural soil, where rice is cultivated. However, major revision should be made to address the issues raised.	Noted. Your comments were constructive and helpful in improving the manuscript.
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	