



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_42634
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of pharmaceutical effluent on the growth of crops in 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	The results of the soil analysis before treatment with pharmaceutical effluents was not presented and also that of the control sample. This will allow for comparison with those after treatment and subsequent evaluation of the amount of pollutants actually present in the environment as well as the plant parts. All the journals in your references have no issue number. In APA style of referencing, "&" is used in joining the names of authors, not "and"	Done
Minor REVISION comments	Line 14, name of journal is not italicised. Line 145, close the gap between pages 205 to 221 Line 147, name of journal not italicised. Reference 6, pages of journal cited is not stated. Reference 9, is not properly written, there is no full stop after year in bracket and the pages are not stated. Line 159, name of journal is not italicised. Reference 11,12, should be written properly. Arrange the names according to the format of referencing. Reference 13,17, 18, 19, names of journal not italicised Reference 20, if this is an online article, provide the web link. Reference 21, check pages and volume or issue numbers presented it may not be correct. Reference 22, volume and pages of article are not properly presented.	Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>