

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_96550
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of the Physicochemical Parameters and Pollution Indices in Soils of Obodo Community in Delta State, Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes</b> , but there are many grammar and typographical errors that have been marked in highlight yellow and corrected in red color on the research, please note that.  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>No</b> , need to view a summary of the results.  <b>No</b> , need more clarification  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It must be double-checked and written again	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript needs to be written again to explain some important points and draw some conclusions.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rashed Taleb Rasheed
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq