Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_51914**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Niche-proxies of soil from rhizosphere of Weeds from Bodo in Gokana, Rivers State, Nigeria.**
Type of the Article	**Manuscript**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Topic** -should reflect aim -See other comment in document **Abstract** -Rewrite abstract -See other comment in document **Introduction** -Explain what interests you to the selected weeds. How important are the selected weeds? Explain earlier research done on the weeds that your results will be analysed against to show case. -There is no flow in content -See other comment in document **Methodology** -Needs clarifications -It is erroneous to compare rhizosphere in different kings of soil without aim to factor in soil type studies. This research is on pollution but not soil types. The difference in soil types nullifies the whole essence of comparison as the results are already known to be different in different types of soil. Plants should have been planted in similar soil types to enable comparison. Or, controls should have been chosen separately for each soil types for comparison. (It is like comparing a cap of water to a cap of coffee). It is certainly different. So, what was the essence of comparing yet you already know it is different. -Reorganize to comply with this -See other comment in document **Analysis of results** -ANOVA is mentioned yet there are no p values to show the differences obtained -Add p values that were obtained in ANOVA and post HOC values to show significant differences -See other comment in document **Discussion** Is too shallow as generalization has been done. Discuss specifics -See other comment in document Conclusion and recommendation -Far-fetched and are speculations -Should be obtained from findings of research -Rewrite the sections -See other comment in document	The manuscript has been thoroughly revised and modified as per the kind suggestions of the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments	-Sentence construction and Language is below average -Check referencing styles and ensure all refences in text appear in reference section	
Optional/General comments	Check table for abbreviations and change of direction of words to fit in to table	

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)*	