SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_55124
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of galena mining in north-eastern Nigeria on nearby food crops.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment Accept the manuscript but with revision	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 Abstract needs to be more robust: It should state that the data were compared with a control –a farming area with no mining activities. And, also to FAO/WHO heavy metal or trace elements permissible concentrations.	All issues raised by the reviewer were corrected. However, the insertion of SD in the chart was not possible because of the decimal places in the work. I crave your indulgence to look into it. Thank you.
	Page 5. It is not clear why the three plant samples were pooled together. What is the rationale?	
	Figure 3. This is a bar chart detailing the mean concentration of the trace elements. It should indicate mean ± standard deviation.	
	A phrase such as 'mean level' or 'mean levels' is wrong and vague. It should be 'mean concentration'.	
	When the list of variable is more than three, it is best to indicate the value next to the variable, and not use 'respectively'. See for example, page 6, section 2.6, page 12, section 3.2. page 13, section 3.3. There are several others	
	My comments are detailed in the comments panel of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There are some grammatical flaws. Highlighted in yellow. For example, 1. Page 1: Anthropogenic activitiesreplace 'includes' with 'include'. 2. Page 2: para 1, para 2, 3. Page 5, para 1. 4. Page 11.	Grammatical flaws were all corrected to the best of our understanding.

PART 2:

		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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There is no any ethical issues.

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)