



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 Title of the work should be changed.	<p>Effect of pharmaceutical industrial effluent on the growth and heavy metal content of okra (A. esculentus) and tomato (L. esculentum)</p> <p>Line 16: The soil on which the plants was grown was analysed (comment: There was no mention of soil in the Materials and Method section of the work)</p> <p>Line 17: watered by should be changed to watered with.</p> <p>Line 22: watered by should be changed to watered with</p> <p>Line 23-25: Should be: The result obtained showed that the industrial effluents significantly affected --- germination, root, stem and shoot length.</p> <p>Comment: There was no result in the result section on germination count, root and shoot length.</p> <p>Highest concentrations of Pb, Cd, Cr, Zn, Cu, Ni and Fe were found in the roots of these crops compared with either the shoot or the leaf.</p> <p>Comment: The experiment lasted for seven days. It is unimaginable that the seedlings would have developed defined roots shoot and leaves within such a short period. Moreover one finds it difficult to believe that within the short experimental period the crops have absorbed and partitioned the heavy metals as reported in the work.</p> <p>Line 34: ' Another point of view is that' should be replaced with 'Moreover'</p> <p>Line 37: delete 'such'</p> <p>Line 38: delete 'but' replace with ' , it also deposits'</p> <p>Line 41: Since different crop species may have different tolerance to various pollutants</p> <p>Comment: This is not a complete sentence.</p> <p>The author could replace the incomplete statement with 'Different crop species may have different tolerance to various pollutants.</p> <p>Line 47: The materials and method should be re –written because the author failed to give a good description of what was done. Materials and method should be clear so that anybody who wishes to repeat the experiment will be able to do it.</p> <p>Line 50: The full meaning of NARC should be given before the acronym is put in bracket.</p> <p>Line 55; Whatman not Wattman</p> <p>Line 51; 'equal' not 'equally'</p> <p>Line 55: Plates were labelled as per type ----- (This is not scientific language)</p> <p>Different concns (0, 1%) of each effluent were made with distilled water</p> <p>(Comment: How many effluents did the author use?. The question arises because the author stated 'each effluent' indicating that there was more than one effluent.</p> <p>Line 57: 'Respective effluent concns were provided and incubated' (Comment: this statement not meaningful. Did the author incubate the effluent or the seeds of okra and tomato treated with various levels of effluent?</p> <p>Line 58; 'Daily observation were made for the germinated seed' should be changed to 'Germination count was taken daily.</p> <p>Line 59; Should be 'The treated seeds were exposed to light for 7 days'</p> <p>Line 62; 'For dry weight seeds were incubated' It is not clear whether the author means that 'the seedlings were dried in the oven'</p> <p>Line 59: Before shifting, 10 ml of the nutrient solution was provided with the same concn of effluent. (Comment: this statement is not clear.)</p> <p>Line 68: delete 'a' insert 'the'. Values not value</p> <p>Generally the Materials and Method was poorly presented.</p> <p>Tables</p> <p>All values presented should be to the same number of decimal place.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 130-132: The increase in the values of these elements from the control might be as a result of these elements present in soil and pharmaceutical effluent as well as in the plant (Comment: There was no mention of soil in the Material and Method section of the work)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I doubt that the work was carried out. As indicated in the Materials and Method, the seeds were planted in petri-dishes but in the abstract and conclusion, the author was referring to soil.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Anthony O. Ano</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Root Crops Research Institute, Nigeria</i>