SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJASS_46216**
Title of the Manuscript:	**TRACE HEAVY METALS IN ROADSIDE SOILS ALONG A MAJOR TAFFIC CORRIDOR IN AN EXPANDING METROPOLIS**
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	1. **Quote "***Iron (Fe), Copper (Cu),***" authors can just use the chemical symbol straight instead of abbreviate the term again and again. Please correct for the rest of the manuscript including the figures' caption** 2. **Start away use the chemical symbol in the abstract and the main text. And be consistent with the word usage throughout** 3. **Add province/district/city/country for figure1a caption** 4. **"**Hydrochloric acid and Nitric acid**" do not need capital letter on the first letter of the word.** https://www.aje.com/en/arc/editing-tip-capitalization-chemical-compounds/ 5. **Figure 1a does not need necessary. Please delete. Since author included similar figure in the Result section.** 6. **Author should not start the Table numbering according to section. Table number should start from Table1, and then table 2 so on. Please renumber all the tables and also correct those in the text.** 7. **Table description should be at the top of the table** 8. **Also for Table 1 (Table 4.1) do not put a note saying "**Note that all concentrations are in µ/mg**". There are two recommended ways you can do in this case. 1. On the first row you can labelled "Fe (**µ/mg**)", Cd (**µ/mg**); or 2. You can just put a italics legend at the bottom of the Table. *Concentration for all the analyses are in µ/mg*.** https://www.scienceeditingexperts.com/blog/creating-tables-in-scientific-papers-basic-formatting-and-titles 9. **Also avoid shading or giving colour to the tables. Colouring are not necessary** 10. **Figure 3 Y-axis. Spelling error for "Cadmium"** 11. **Is there any reason for figure 5 to have negative values? AAS cathode lamp problem? Please check. Otherwise just remove lead from the analysis.** 12. **Try number the headers** 13. **About the heavy metal on road dust. Please also look into the tyre dust.** 14. **Please redo the numbering for the figures** 15. **Please redo your conclusion. It should be a summary of your article, your result and your arguments, and not about the harm of heavy metal. The harm of heavy metal should be in the introduction section.** https://patthomson.net/2012/04/06/concluding-the-journal-article/ 16. **Change "Recommendation" to "Author's suggestions on possible improvement".**	1. This correction has been effected 2. The chemical symbols are now being used 3. The Local Government Area has been added 4. This has been corrected 5. Figure 1 is maintained because figure two shows only the road of interest and the sampling points 6. Tables appropriately numbered and re-numbered 7. Table description taken to the top of the table 8. Correction effected 9. Colours removed from the tables 10. Cadmium spelling corrected 11. The AAS cathode lamp is in order 12. Headers added 13. Our discussion suggests that some of the heavy metals in the road side may have emanated from the abrasion of tires. 14. All figures renumbered 15. The conclusion redone.

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Summary and GENERAL COMMENTS. A investigation of heavy metal in the soil at the roadside of a major highway in Nigeria. The language is alright. Methods seem to be alright, however for Pb section, the graph seem a little weird. Formatting of the paper need a lot of improvements. And conclusion does not need to be written properly.	All general comments taken care of.

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.