



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47950
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION ANALYSIS OF TOXIC METALS DISTRIBUTION AND POLLUTION INDICES IN SOIL, BEANS AND MAIZE SAMPLES OF KANO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>The introduction verbatim quotes passages from https://www.jchps.com/specialissues/Special%20issue3/42%20jchps%20si3%20addn%20sailaja%20175-181.pdf without quoting the authors Rajeswari and Sailaja; this may be plagiarism. The introduction also contains a mixture of data on health and environmental risks, many dealing with effects of high exposures that do not occur in soil and agricultural contexts. The text is unbalanced; as an example line 21 states toxic metals are confined to higher atomic numbers; this is not true since even light metals like Li and Be may be toxic. The UNEP report http://www.resourcepanel.org/reports/environmental-risks-and-challenges-anthropogenic-metals-flows-and-cycles in its annex 3 has a balanced and relatively new presentation of effects of the four studied metals in an environmental context. A summary based on UNEP could avoid the plagiarism issue and provide better balance.</p> <p>Section 3.1 deals only with grains – how was soil treated? Concentration and intake units are missing at several equations No reason is given for the ordering of samples in the figures 1-4</p>	Proper citation has been given to avoid similarity
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Language and editing review is necessary. Examples: Line 15 Concentration concentration; unnecessary capitalisation in lines 20-21 Line 16-17 Results indicates indicate Line 34 unexplained abbreviation LGA Line 115 what man Whatman Line 127 Symbols in equation do not match symbols in explanation below</p> <p>(no further examples are given but there are many others)</p>	<p>Language editing has been done Corrected Done Corrected Given full form Done Equation checked and corrected</p>
Optional/General comments		