



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47666
Title of the Manuscript:	Source Identification of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Water at Point of Effluent discharge point into the New Calabar River, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the 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>The manuscript presents a local study of PAHs in water samples, which is of interest for the environmental sciences. However, this is required to make major changes:</p> <p>The Introduction section of the manuscript requires extensive revision. The authors need to expand the review of literature that is relevant to their study and the scientific contribution must be clarified. The aim of the study needs to be properly highlighted and selection of PAHs must be justified.</p> <p>L15 Please, it should be used "showed" instead of "gave"</p> <p>L58 please, it should be used "<i>n</i>-hexane" instead of "hexane"</p> <p>L52 It must be provided the criteria for site selection</p> <p>L57 It must be briefly provided the conditions and technique used for both extraction and purification</p> <p>L60 It must be provided chromatographic conditions and merit figures (<i>r</i>, limit of detection, limit of quantification, precision, accuracy, recovery etc.) How were corrected the interferences?</p> <p>L64 The Results and Discussion section must be improved. This must be presented more clearly and discussed properly. A statistical analysis should be used to justify results.</p> <p>L66 title should be as table header</p> <p>L78 to 83 Those paragraphs should be included in the Introduction section</p> <p>L87 The concentrations reported are very high, some of those values found are higher than solubility than compounds in water.</p> <p>L106 please, units must be provided</p> <p>L115 please, use "PAHs" instead of "Pahs"</p> <p>L131 please, I think that "input" must be corrected</p> <p>L162 It is advisable that conclusions agree with results and the discussion of the work itself</p> <p>L167 Please, it should be used "in order" instead of "inorder"</p>	<p>The Correction has been made as per the comments</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Section has been improved accordingly</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	