



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_49886
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF SELECTED HEAVY METALS IN TOBACCO TREE SHRUBS GROWING AROUND DANDORA DUMPSITE, NAIROBI, KENYA
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>)



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 English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Also, some minor typos, grammar and syntax errors should be carefully revised and corrected accordingly.</p> <p>Keywords Authors should rephrase keywords. Do not use words or terms in the title as keywords: the function of keywords is to supplement the information given in the title. Words in the title are automatically included in indexes, and keywords serve as additional pointers.</p> <p>Introduction: The authors do not provide specific goal, hypothesis, question, or otherwise, purpose for the study. This makes it very confusing, leaving the reader with no clear understanding what is the point(s) that the authors are trying to make. It is the author's responsibility to provide a clear hypothesis/aim/goal/question that the study is set to answer. Since a sincere evaluation of the approach and the methodology that were employed needs to be done in reference to the goals of the research, the fact that no clear goal is given makes it hard to evaluate the soundness of the study. Please make explicit the purpose of the work, at the end of the "Introduction" section (For example: "The present work has been undertaken with the following objectives:...").</p> <p>Materials and methods: In this section you should specify the characteristics of all equipments (report model, brand name, city and country of manufacturer).</p> <p>About study area, this sub-section needs more information. Please provide information on geology, soil types and climatic parameters, namely precipitation and temperature.</p> <p>Lines 64-65: In the spelling of the scientific names of the species, the binomial nomenclature rules should be applied always! Both the first part of the name, the genus, and the second part, the species, should be italicized when a binomial name occurs in normal text, <u>but the botanical authority not</u>.</p> <p>Authors should pay more attention to abbreviations and symbols. For example, "M" (meter)</p>	



and "KM" (kilometre) should be "m" and "km" respectively; Also "°c" should be "°C"; etc.

Line 73: The authors should give more details on the method of sequential extraction.

Authors should explain the option of studying these three metals.

This section should also give more details about Quality Assurance and Quality Control. Authors should indicate the obtained accuracy values. It would be also interesting to provide the reader with limits of detection/determination of analyzed elements.

In addition, the "Materials and methods" section needs a subsection on statistical tests. Although the use of statistics in the study is obvious, the statistical methods should be clearly described in appropriate sub-section.

Results and discussion:
The authors refer to "total metal content". However, they used a digestion method with nitric acid, perchloric acid and hydrochloric acid. Therefore, no hydrofluoric acid was used, so the silicates were not dissolved and therefore the measured concentrations are not total. They are only pseudo-totals. Since this method is not intended to accomplish total decomposition of the sample, the extracted analyte concentrations may not reflect the total content in the sample. Therefore, if the authors intended to obtain the total concentrations, the samples digestion method was poorly chosen.

Tables 1 to 7: Authors should indicate the number of samples (n =). What is the meaning of the ± (error? Standard deviation?).

Throughout the manuscript: "*Nicotiana glauca graham.*" should be "*Nicotiana glauca Graham*"

I cannot understand the statistical analysis. The authors using parametric statistics (Pearson correlation coefficients). Have the authors check for normality? Authors should explain which test they used for evaluation of the normality of the analysed features. It is known, for the scientist working on evaluation of pollutants, that these substances rarely own normal distributions but highly skewed to the left and showing long right tails. Taking this into account I wonder they decided to use directly parametric statistics (Pearson correlation) without (at least this is not noted in the manuscript) any previous evaluation of normality (e.g. Shapiro-Wilk test). For data not showing normal distributions there are a lot



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>of equivalent statistical test that allow to do the same analysis but in a proper way.</p> <p>Overall, as presented, the ideas, results and discussion provided in the manuscript are not entirely original or attractive, and in particular the results do not seem to advance in the direction the authors imply (besides, there are alternative explanations for most of the relationships found). The research is purely descriptive and, although I do not see that as a problem per se what-so-ever, it provides no solid statistical evidence to support the discussion.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paulo J. C. Favas
Department, University & Country	University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal