SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_43281**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ESTABLISHING RISK ASSESSMENT FROM RECLAIMED NEKEDE MECHANIC VILLAGE OWERRI, 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)

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	**Materials and Methods: The** protocol of analytical methods employed for the execution of this work is not declared and hence validity of narration and reproducibility of results could be criticized. **Results and Discussions: Data is robust enough and its control is adequate. Discussion and Conclusion is based on the data presented and the requisite statistical analysis of the data (mean, median, etc.) have been done. Inclusion of standard deviation in the Table 2 would add value to it.** **Conclusion drawn is supported by the data presented inside the manuscript and about standard guidelines.** **However, the choice of *Eva* water as a *control water sample*, completely foreign to the source of the samples collected, in my opinion, is a defect in the architecture of the work. The picture of the impact of the Nekede Mechanic Village on the quality of water around it would have been clearer if control samples were taken some good distance upland of the mechanic site, given that it's possible underground water bodies elsewhere within Owerri may have similar results to that of these samples analysed. I believe this information is needed for the conclusion drawn to carry its full significance.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The intention and design of the work is generally good. Statistical analysis of the data is adequate but there is still room for improvement.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Myina, O. M.***
Department, University & Country	***Taraba State University, Nigeria***