SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Soil Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ASRJ_65849**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METAL CONTENTS INTHREE DIFFERENT LAND USEDSOILS IN OHAJI/EGBEMA IMO STATE, NIGERIA**
Type of the 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**Introduction:** **Author has claimed many facts without any reference e.g., largest oil producing zone in country, largest wetland and mangrove forest. Objective and hypothesis are missing. There is no connection or reference for previously done work or novelty of this research.** **Material and methods:** **Figure 2 are not visible enough. No mentioning of the manufacturer of the equipment i.e., EC meter, AAS etc. Soil Sampling and sample compositing method is not mentioned.** **Results and discussion:** **Major revision is needed by relating the results to available literature.** **Conclusion:** **Author remains inconclusive about the results.**	Correction made as suggested Revision amended Done
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction: Grammatical and formatting mistakes should be improved. Lack of continuity between paragraphs. Materials and methods: Explain the protocols followed in little detail. Results and discussion: Some future research question should be raised at the end. Conclusion: No recommendations are given.	Grammatical corrections made Revised Corrected
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20