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)

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. Fig 1-5 then followed by Fig 4.6. This is confusing. Should be revised.** **2. The graphs (Fig 2-5 and Fig 4.6) are better presented in the form of bar graphs. Line graphs are supposed to show *y* as a function of *x* which is not the case in this study.** **3. There is no logical explanation of why *Hg* was included in the study.** **4. In order to enhance a better understanding of the effect of heavy vehicle road pollution on soils a more detailed study of the topography and geology of the sampling positions is necessary. For example it is difficult to pin point the Fe contamination to road traffic pollution according to this study.** **5. Margin of error for the instrument used should also be reported.** **6. Why was spacing of 2.5km chosen for the sampling points?**	1. Figures have been re-numbered 2. Graphs have been represented as bar graphs 3. *Hg* was included because it was one of the heavy metals identified 4. The topography of the region is relatively flat apart from the section it was suggested that higher levels observed in the control values may have arisen from the dip in the topography. The background levels of heavy metals for the area had already been established from literature. 5. The entire length of road under study was measured and divided by the total number of pre-determined samples.
	There are numerous grammatical errors which require revision.	All grammatical errors have been identified and corrected.
Optional/General comments		

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 no ethical issues in this manuscript.