



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_34652
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME METHODS USED IN THE DETERMINATION OF METALS IN SOIL AND SEDIMENTS
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 highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	CHANGE TITLE TO: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME DIGESTION METHOD USED IN..... SOME REFERENCES CITED IN TEXT ARE OMITED. e.g. Pichtel et al., Benas, Saxena. REFERENCES: Method used is inconsistent. Allow, B.J. should be ALLOWAY, B.J. Expunge from Line 51-58. Table 1 and 2 not table 4.1 and 4.2	The title have been corrected the author has agreed with the reviewer on the change of the title. The later express and reveal the workdone more precise. NB. The author has substituted the Benas 2005 with Ehi 2012. This is because the same methods Benas in 2005, Ehi also used it in 2012. Considering the most recent the author chooses to cite Ehi (2012). The author requests that reviewer should give a reference pattern if the one used is still not consistent.
Minor REVISION comments	Correct Grammatical Errors and Spelling mistakes as indicated. Line 5: study, in order, frequently used digestion methods. Line 6: samples... were Line 11: Saxena (1990). Line 13: Calcium and Iron were chosen, Line 14: Results obtained show. Line 15: To examine, frequently used digestion methods. Line 24: Been recognized, Line 26: where Line 27: Elements. Also it supplies. Line 28: its. Line 30: Dube et al., Line 32: influenced Line 46: Locations, samples, Line 61: were, methods, Line 65: Controlled. Line 75: Sexena (1990). Line 77: mortar and pestle, sieved. Line 79: was, Line 81: made up to, Line 86: heated at 105⁰C. Line 89: made up to, line 94: Involve, Line 119: Results, Line 147: has. Line 154: This is probably, Line 156: mineral acids.	Grammatical errors have been corrected and highlighted in yellow. The author has agreed with the reviewer.
Optional/General comments	The study investigated some methods used in digestion of samples and not methods used in Analysis of sample. Digestion method is simply sample preparation.	Noted