



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title: Concentrations of Cd, Cu, Pb and Zn in soils and vegetable organs from periurban agriculture areas of Abidjan in Cote D'Ivoire. The paper reports the concentration of Cu, Zn, Cd and Pb in soil and 2 species of plants (sweet potato and hibiscus) cultivated in areas closed to Abidjan, Ivory Coast. General comments It contains useful data but it needs a profound English revision. Laboratory analysis Were the vegetable samples, collected at the same place analyzed separately or as a composite sample? Specify on the text.	General comments English was edited throughout the text and changes are highlighted in yellow. Laboratory analysis See lines 82 – 84: Plant organs sampling coupled with that of soil (1/4) resulting 3 three samples of each of leaf, stem and root according to vegetables and by site. They were analyzed separately as hibiscus or sweet potato according to organ nature [lines 102-106].

	Specify the number of replicates/sample and the standard deviation for each obtained result. Why Moyenne was included in Table 3 and it is not mentioned on the text? Justify it. Line 15 – the urban population is most important than that of rural zone; this statement must be better discussed: why? Line 34 – incomplete: i) to determine the (???????) of these.....	12 soil samples were taken by site coupled with 3 samples of each of the leaf, stem and root for hibiscus and sweet potato respectively. Standard deviations are included in Tables 2, 3 and 4. Because of ANOVA (already including data variability) procedure, this additional information was deemed more sounded for the average values in Table 3 and 4. This was an omission when translating French to English. It might be “Average”. Additional informations are included in Line 15 Revised (Line 33-34): i) to determine these metal concentrations in soils and plants in relation with other soil characteristics,
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 35 – item ii) identify vegetable species The presented study was focused only in 2 species: hibiscus and sweet potato? Line 37 - According to this paper: :”Roughly, the study will point out soil characteristics and vegetable species most relevant to contamination “ This statement must be better explained since this paper reports the study of only 2 selected species. Line 53/205 – entropic or anthropic ? Soil pollution, at least, is not an entropic consequence..... Line 74 – Table 1 is presented without any comment.	Revised (Line 34-35) : ii) identify the most prone to contamination risk among the studied vegetable species as local mass market products, Line 36-38: this statement is revised to be specific to the studied vegetable species as local mass market product. Revised: Line 53/ 212 Yes! But we miss data that could be relevant to atmospheric pollution while, analyse of current results allowed suspicion of anthropic consequence. See line 136-137: Soil contents of metals were compared to the standard values of Table 1
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Also I would suggest the modification of its position in the text. Line 96 - $1\text{NNH}_4\text{OAc}$ Line 139 – “Roughly, there I significant ,,,,,,” ? Line 225 – organic-Pb^{2+} and Pb^+ Discussion Is there any importance of the traffic contribution for metal contamination in the soil? (For example as source of Pb)	Move from line 74 to 107 actually Line 94: Revised as $1\text{NH}_4\text{OAc}$ Line 142: Revised : Roughly, there is significant..... Line 233: Revised: organic-Pb^{2+} and Pb^+ Discussion This was also concerned by the discussion done from line 244 to 248.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		