



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_24394
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Heavy metals occurrences in Sediment of Lagos Lagoon using Environmental Indices
Type of the Article	Case study

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	This paper represents a recent spatial and temporal database about the status of contamination in the Lagos Lagoon. However, this paper is poorly written in term of the arrangement of topics and the data presentation. In the introduction part, the authors did not clearly highlight the justification of their study and the different in their study than the others in the particular area. Section materials and methods should be rewritten because too many grammatical errors and they did not mention the sampling time. The authors have mixed the result and discussion even though they have clearly stated the parts of result and discussion. Discussion and conclusion are inconclusive because both sections have been drawn without enough supporting data, mainly when referring to possible contamination sources. The strong point of this paper is the part of dealing with the contamination indexes, but very lacks of interpretation when addressing the possible sources of contamination in the study area.	Authors have reviewed all the suggested areas and made necessary corrections.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Specific Comments Text. * Remove italic style font for Table and Figure. Page 1, line 13. Please delete the space between word ".... sediment. The...." Page 1, line 13. Please delete the word "detected" Page 1, line 14. Please change the sentence to "the analyzed sediments were exceeded the USEPA value of 9.8 mg/kg."	All the comments have been taken into considerations and the paper adjusted where necessary. Thank you.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 1, line 14. Please delete the sentence “while station 5 had the highest concentration of 72.86 mg/kg in the dry and 89.65 mg/kg in wet seasons respectively.” Page 1, line 15. Please delete the space between word “analyzed during” Page 1, line 16. Please delete the word “at” Page 1, line 17. Please change to “(P<0.01)” Page 1, line 19. Please delete the word “at” Page 1, line 31. Please delete the space between word “.... edge. Wastes....” Page 1, line 31. Remove the capitol letter L for lagoon. Page 1, line 33. Remove the italic for “etc” Page 1, line 33. Please delete the word “sensitive foundation” Page 1, line 34. Please delete the word “both” and delete the space between word “.....ecosystem. The...” Page 1, line 34 – 37. The sentences should be rewritten. Page 1, line 37. Remove the capitol letter for “Arsenic, Copper, Iron” Page 2, line 63. Please delete the space between the word “Lagos Lagoon” Page 2, line 67. Please change the sentence to “Fig 1: Map showing the sampling points in the Lagos Lagoon” Page 3, line 71 – 96. This part should be revised and rewritten. Page 4, line 104. Subtopic title is too long (should be revised) Page 4, line 106. Please rewrite this sentence and I cannot find where is fig 2-6. Page 4, line 112 – 113. This sentence should be moved to discussion part. Page 4, line 118 – 120. This sentence should be	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	moved to discussion part. Page 6, line 153. Remove the capitol letter for “ dry and wet” ** There are more grammatical and typing errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper is poorly written and too many grammatical and typing errors. The whole parts in this paper should be revised and rewritten if the authors have intention to publish their works in this journal. The authors should polish their English writing skills in order to present and discuss the data with more convincing. The authors should proofread their paper before submitting to the journal. References writing in this paper did not follow the format as described in the author-instruction.	Authors have looked into your suggested points. It has been revised. Thank you.