



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_37688
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Heavy Metals and Phytochemical analysis of some selected Vegetables grown at Kalambaina Area Sokoto.
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	Abstract, table 1 and item 3.2: Please correct the number of significant figures for measurement according to the standard deviation. For some results, the SD is bigger than the measurement. It may be more appropriate to indicate that the measurement is below the limit of quantification. I marked it in all text. Item 2.2: Please, show the coordinates of each sampling site. If possible, insert a map. Lines 58 and 64: Please, specify the exact temperature. Line 59: Please, specify the sieve size (mesh). Item 2.3: Is there same standard procedure for this extraction? If yes, please, cite the reference. Line 65: Please, specify the rotation speed. Lines 65 and 74: Please, specify the number of whatman filter paper. Item 2.5: Please, cite the limit of quantification for each metal. Item 2.6: Since those tests are qualitative, it would be interesting to cite the order of detection of the method. Please, cite a reference for each test. Sometimes authors use cm^3, sometimes, mL. Please, standardize it. Line 108: GraphPad Table 2: How is the criterion for judging presence in low, moderate and high concentration? It seems to be subjective. Explain it in the text. Item 3.2. It is advisable to deepen the discussion, for example, to justify the presence of certain metals in greater quantity than others, to correlate it with properties of the soils, etc. Lines 156-157: Is this comparison reasonable? The study of Satarug et al was conducted in the same kind of soil? Line 164: Ajiboye et al. did not evaluate the same vegetables than those evaluate in this work. Lines 166, 170, 175: The expression "moderately present" is not very scientific. What does this quantitatively represent?	1. Noted and corrected 2. Noted and added 3. Noted and added 4. Noted and added 5. Reference has been cited 6. Noted and added 7. Whatman filter paper specified 8. Noted and added 9. Noted, ml was used all through and references have been cited for each test. 10. Noted and corrected 11. The criterion was done according to the Okerulu et al., Anthony et al. and Mercy. 12. Noted and modified 13. Noted and removed 14. Noted and removed 15. The expression moderately present is used for the qualitative screening of phytochemicals. It have been used by Mercy, Okerulu et al. and Anthony et al.
Minor REVISION comments	Item 2.1: I suggest showing the formula of all reagents or none.	1. Noted and corrected
Optional/General comments	I suggest a deeper discussion about the results so that the text is not merely informative. For example, discuss why the contents of certain metals are higher than of others, the relationship between the metal content in the plant and the properties of the soil etc.	1. Noted and discussion have been modified