



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_41402
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METAL CONCENTRATIONS IN LEACHATES AND SOILS OF CENTRAL BANK OF NIGERIA DUMPSITE ALONG UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE ROAD- MAKURDI
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 manuscript Ms_AJACR_41402 reports on the assessment of heavy metal concentrations in leachates and soils of central bank of Nigeria dumpsite along university of agriculture road- makurdi. There is a scope left to improve the presentation further. Having said that, this manuscript is not acceptable for publication in its current form and, therefore, I must recommend major revisions.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Although present abstract highlights the results, however, it does not give any brief account of the background to deduce the justification for this work. Normally an abstract should include the above along with stating briefly the purpose of the study undertaken and meaningful conclusions based on the obtained results. Hence, this needs rewriting. I would expect brief, yet concise, the quantitative description in the abstract. 2. Throughout, the level of English used needs to be improved substantially. The sentences are badly worded with repetitive words. Most of the part is badly worded with long sentences. Please consider breaking longer sentences into smaller fragments for easy understanding. Authors are advised to seek help from a native English speaker. There are several gramatical, typo errors and contextual errors, for example, L8-9: The concentrations of heavy metals.... was determined. Replace "was" with a plural form. 3. Throughout the manuscript different abbreviations have been used without prior expression. All abbreviations used should be mentioned at their first mention place followed by abbreviated one. 4. Referencing is not always correct. There are several sentences which lacks a proper reference. Either remove them or include a proper reference. For example, L24-26, L41, needs a proper reference. 5. Introduction section is very little and doesn't account the whole background of the work. I would suggest to include a paragraph on heavy metal detection strategies along with potential merits and demerits. Authors are advised to consult following reference and include them to strengthen the study. Also, all seven references in the Introduction are old with latest from 2014. Update some with recent ones and include the followings, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hernandez-Vargas et al. 2018. Electrochemical Biosensors: A Solution to Pollution Detection with Reference to Environmental Contaminants. <i>Biosensors</i>, 8(2), 29. • Bilal et al. 2018. Biosorption: An Interplay between Marine Algae and Potentially Toxic Elements—A Review. <i>Marine drugs</i>, 16(2), 65. • Rasheed et al. 2018. Fluorescent sensor based models for the detection of environmentally-related toxic heavy metals. <i>Science of The Total Environment</i>, 615, 476-485. 6. What was the source of Fig. 1? It is authors responsibility to avoid copyright issues. For example, Fig. 1. I wonder if the permission has been taken from the source? If so, the statement like Reproduced with permission from... should be declared. 7. Table 1: Reference should be given for the last column WHO limits. 8. Each experiment involved with a range of samples. All Tables lacks SD values, what was the sample size? Inclusion of statistical analysis would be great. 9. Figure 2 lacks error bars. Reconstruct in 2D format instead in 3D. 10. References are not up to date and as old as 90s. There is only one reference from 2016 and rest are old. There are many new studies available from 2017-2018. Please include the one suggested above and update accordingly. 	<p>The corrections on the abstract as instructed by the reviewer have been effected as instructed.</p> <p>The grammar has been revised and minor error on the manuscript has been infected. Especially the typo errors</p> <p>"Was" has been replace with form Abbreviations have been written in full as instructed by the reviewer</p> <p>Reference have been revised especially L24-26 and L41</p> <p>Introduction has been revised with latest literatures added as advised by the reviewers</p> <p>Source of Figure 1 has been revised</p> <p>This section has been revised</p> <p>SD value on the manuscript is appropriate. There is no need for additional values. The figure is appropriate for the research work. References has been revised</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		