



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_34754
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Climate Change through Temperature increase on Heavy Metals Concentrations in Water and Sediment of Ekpan Creek, Delta State, 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	<p>The article needs a major revision in the presentation and discussion of the data and an extensive correction of the English that is confusing and difficult to understand the same. It is generally recommended that the text and graphics be organized in order to discuss the effects of seasonality and spatiality on results and relationships with anthropic factors.</p> <p>The items that need to be corrected are listed below.</p> <p>Figure 1- indicate the direction of river flow on the map.</p> <p>In study area- indicate when the rainy season starts and the drought ends, this must also be indicated in all the graphs of the work.</p> <p>Sampling sites - the descriptions of depths of the samples are correct (3.56 +/- 5.65), 5.12 +/- 7.71) ... ???? CHECK. STRANGE VARIATION IS GREATER THAN THE MEAN.</p> <p>The second paragraph of the results: Air temperature ranged from 27.9°C to 33.4°C, water temperature from 28°C to 34°C; TDS, 463 to 503; OD, 4.12 to 7.44 mg / L; Hardness, 85.47 to 125 mg / L; Phosphate is unnecessary because it is repeated in individual discussions and can be eliminated.</p> <p>Table 1 presents the same results as tables 2 and 3 in the river and should have its title homogenized with them.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>In these tables values that are above the allowed should be highlighted in bold or in different color. All the graphs must be made having the property (Cu, DO, BOD ...) in the ordinates and the seasonality (ten, jan, fev ...) in the abscissa, with repetition in the same graph for all the stations (S1, S2 , ...) of the geotype that was plotted in figure 3 and include the limit allowed in the legislation by including a bar showing the limit.</p> <p>In figure 4 clarify why the values for the months of December and April are much higher than in the other months. Does this have to do with the beginning of the dry season? Make it clear that it is not an effect of spatiality because it occurs in all seasons and for almost all measured properties.</p> <p>In figure 6 - standardize the way of writing the names (in writing or by the symbol), identify each graph by acronym A1, A2 ... (for water data) and B1, B2 ... (for sediment data And discuss all of them relating to the initial graphs (OD, pH and T) and anthropic factors.</p> <p>In Figure 7- Separate the graph of the sulfate from the other parameters. The scale of PO4 and NO3 should be smaller so that they can be understood and compared with the graph of sulfate, as discussed in the text.</p> <p>Revise text: Although, BOD and DO concentrations followed a seasonal pattern of being higher in the dry season</p> <p>Months than wet, a slight increase was observed in the months of February, March and April 2010 than The other months. This was expected because biological process changes rapidly in aquatic systems, with</p> <p>Increase in dissolved oxygen concentrations, and consequent increase in biological oxygen</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Demand which will decrease afterwards. It does not match the OD(fig 4) and BOD (fig 5) graphs presented. The bibliography needs to be extensively reviewed and recent articles on the subject matter need to be incorporated into the work. One of the major problems of the article is the lack of recent work (with a maximum of 3 years) to better justify the effect of climate change.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I suggest that the work be returned to the authors for an extensive correction of both English and the presentation of the results, as well as an extension of the bibliography with more recent articles.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luiz Di Souza
Department, University & Country	Department of Chemistry, State University of Rio Grande do Norte - UERN, Brazil