



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_34029
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Physicochemical and Selected Heavy Metal of Soil around Dana Steel Industry Limited Katsina, Katsina 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	1. Referring to lines 92 and 93, the “physicochemical parameters” should be identified specifically and describe their analysis in the manuscript. These parameters must be elaborated and explained in the manuscript and how they are measured. 2. Referring to Table 1 between lines 114 and 115, the samples sites (A, B, C, D) must be identified. No where in the manuscript these site are identified and characterized in which their properties explained. What are the identities of the soils studied, etc.? 3. The cause of the suspected contaminants. toxicities are not explained fairly! 4. There is no overall and comprehensive background information (about the sites, soil type, cause of the possible contaminant and toxicity level, etc.). these information is lacking in this manuscript. 5. Line 17 – line 18, the writers talk about environmental pollution facing humanity but there is no environmental assessment regarding the site of study and the rational for the study. This manuscript is lacking comprehensive details on all	1. It has been captured and restructured as suggested. But the methods used in the determination are standard established methods, hence they are only referred to. 2. The sampling sites have been identified. The identity of the soil is not the target in the present study but the properties and heavy metals level which were captured in the manuscript. 3. The activities of the steel industry are suspected to causes environmental problems to the immediate environment. Hence the motivation to assess the environmental contamination by heavy metal. 4. Noted and improved 5. The rational behind this study is to see whether presence of the Dana steel have any effect in terms of heavy metals accumulation in the soil of the study area. 6. The observations have been noted and improved upon



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of the items listed in 1-5.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Examining some of the parameters listed in table 1, it seems that the sites are not able to sustain any biological activities. Provide recommendation for further study to mitigate the problems on the sites.	The observation has been noted and recommendations were captured under conclusion
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the manuscript is written well and in good English, it lacks basic information on all sections of the manuscript.	Thanks for the commendations. For the basic information suggested, it has been improved.