



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_15140
Title of the Manuscript:	Concentrations of Cadmium (Cd), Copper (Cu), Lead (Pb) and Zinc (Zn) in Soils and Vegetable Organs from Periurban Agriculture Areas of Abidjan in Cote d'Ivoire
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract Line 4: hibiscus is not an usual name. In this paper, it is "Dah" which is the usual name of "<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>" (scientific name). Line 4: write "potato" not "patato". Introduction Lines 26-27: write "Côte-d'Ivoire" not "Cote d'Ivoire". Line 33: see Line 4 of Abstract. Line 35: In this study, there are 2 vegetables. So the second aim it is not possible. Aim 3: It is not good to practice phytoremediation with crop even if with no edible plant organs.	Revised as required: Dah! However, this is a local name which can miss understanding for international readers as target of the journal. Thus, we use both Hibiscus and Dah throughout the text. Revised as "Potato" Introduction Revised as "Côte d'Ivoire" Revised as "sweet potato" Yes, this investigation should concerned only the studied vegetables, hence specification was done This is a personal opinion contrasting with that of many scientists: sunflower, tobacco, red beet, common bean, with cabbage....have been tested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for soil cleaning (e.g. Kayser et al., 2000; Banuelos, 2001; Poniedzialek et al., 2010). Of course! Using weed or grass should be better when referring to human. However, it may be harmful for animals. Furthermore, plant edibility is dietary habit somewhat differing with community. Thus, non edible plant organs in some area can be preferred elsewhere. The question rose can be summarized as: Phytoremediation is also a plant contamination? And how far? Our third aim can provide answers.
Material and Methods Line 53: write “anthropic” not “entropic”. Line 64: see line 4 of Abstract. Line 74: Where are references of standard ranges of soil content of metallic trace elements? Line 105: write “H₂O₂” not “H₂0₂”. Results The representation of metal contents in soil is not credible. Authors could use histograms and compare soil contents and with standards.	Material and Methods Line 53: change done Line 64 & 65: write potato Line 100: The reference is Alloway (28) cited in line 102 in previous version of the paper. Table 1 is actually located next to this reference in Line 107. Line 104: Change done Results I which you mean reliable as illustration and not credible: credibility should be relevant to measurement methods of which we all agree!!!! Histograms are also included (Fig.3) although, mean values were already mentioned in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 139: "there I significant..."?	when presenting Fig.2. Critical values are also indicated respectively. Actually revised as "There is significant..." in line 142.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		