



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_27123
Title of the Manuscript:	Transfer Characteristics of Trace metals from Soil to the edible Parts of some Vegetable Species Grown in Ibeno, South-south Nigeria
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		
Minor REVISION comments	• In the section 2.4.1, soil digestion reference should coated • Using of filter paper whatman 541 some time the paper it self adsorbs certain quantity of trace metals. We need the clarity about the filtration. • In 2.6 Trans factor the author mentioned about the TF. (must give table format in the result and discussion.) • In 2.7 the author have mentioned about the ANNOVA . but presented the table in the result and discussion.	1. The reference is given. 2. That is true each method of analysis has its inherent disadvantages. We used filtration and the reference is cited. 3. TF figures have been changed to tables as suggested. 4. The AVOVA test result are not to be presented in a table. The results have been utilised in the discussions. eg in 3.1 The trends and comparisons between mean metal levels in soils at $P = 0.05$ are stated clearly
Optional/General comments	• The author has given the technical standards of the methods and sufficient details about methods and methodology. • The result and discussion is ok , he must give the result in the table format of TF and annova. • Conclusion is good, all reference are relevant and adequate.	