



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_44666
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metal Concentration and Physiochemical Parameters in Soil and Plants near Unengineered Dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of Article:	Original research papers

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>In abstract, the acronyms should be in bracket, while the full meanings are written first. For instance, Bioaccumulation Factor (BAF).</p> <p>Grammar should be checked and corrected. For instance, in abstract, PLI of 4.6 and 4.5 'show' not 'shows'; values obtained 'show' not 'shows'. Again, the reports are better put in past tense.</p> <p>In methodology, authors mentioned that 4 samples of soil were collected, but from Table 3, only two samples represented by S1 and S2 were given. If authors had composited the samples from choba and Ade-George, then it must be stated in the method, not to confuse the readers.</p> <p>Almost all the tables still have parameters without units. Table 6 has 'field data' section; the authors have not answered the question as to whether the 'field data' was measure in situ.</p> <p>Though it is acceptable to present results separate from (and before) discussion, presenting results and discussion simultaneously must follow a pattern, which the authors didn't.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tables and Figures are mentioned in the discussion before being presented. For instance, Table 5 and Figure 3 should be presented in section 3.2, after mentioning them.</li> <li>2. Items listed in Tables should not be directly presented in the discussion.</li> </ol> <p>It was suggested that the authors compare their metal concentrations in plants and soil with set limits. This has not been done.</p> <p>Index of Geoaccumulation is 'result' itself, so authors inference 'Index of Geoaccumulation results' is inappropriate.</p> <p>Moreover, the response (<b>Correction done</b>) given by the authors is not acceptable. It was expected that the authors responded to each concern of the reviewer. In any comment the authors do not agree with the reviewer, they should indicate against the comment and give their reasons.</p> <p>Kindly revisit the references in the list; they are not in the same pattern yet.</p>	<p><b>Agreed and Corrected. Acronyms in bracket for Bioaccumulation factor, and the meaning written first.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed and Corrected. S removed from the "shows".</b></p> <p><b>Disagree. The result in table 3 is the average result for each sampling site. Details of individual sampling results are not included here. See "Average"</b></p> <p><b>Agreed and Corrected. Field removed from the "field data" as parameters are measured in the laboratory; and units added to the parameters in the table.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed and Corrected. Tables and figures are presented after mentioning them.</b></p> <p><b>The comparism with set limit was done in the index of geoaccumulation analysis, as it compares it with background or shale concentration.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed. Values/results mentioned after Index of geoaccumulation removed.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed, noted and corrected</b></p> <p><b>Agreed, the names before some of the reference numbers has been removed.</b></p>