



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_50132
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROPELLET PARTICLES: A VECTOR OF HYDROPHOBIC ENDOCRINE DISRUPTING CHEMICALS IN LAGOS LAGOON
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This is a study that likely complements to in Nigeria. This fact should be stressed both in the introduction and material & methods.</p> <p>Major points to be addressed in the revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology for data collection tide, weather and/or current condition not clearly defined. The map location for the study should be described more in details (i.e. lat/long sampling station, river flowing into the lagoon, demographic information, coastal activities etc). Location for surface and sediment sampling not clearly defined. Weather condition contribute to micro plastic distribution, however not considered in the discussion or conclusion 	<p>In introduction; more emphasize is placed on Nigeria in paragraph 30-37, 48-53 and 69-72. It was further stressed in methodology under the description of sampling area 81-88.</p> <p>The weather and current condition was clearly stated in paragraph (89-96)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The coordinate of Lagos Lagoon was cited in paragraph (82-83) The sampling station with each of the points were illustrated in the map of the study area The weather condition was considered in the discussion and conclusion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Minor points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 4 indicate ST6 accumulation of micro plastic was higher but was not explain Figure 8 indicate station 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8 indicate a significant difference between season, however not explain methodology. Reference style is not complying with journal requirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 4 results was explained in paragraph (188-192) Figure 8 result was further explained in paragraph (240-245) between the sampled matrices The reference has been rewrite to fit the Journal format
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>In conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> standardising the use of English US or UK SI metric i.e. location of the study area Reference style to comply with journal requirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The English has been standardized to use of English in US The reference has been rewrite to fit the Journal format

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>	