

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_121085
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of heavy metals and physico-chemical parameters of sewage water, soil in different blocks jaipur district of rajasthan india
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is important in order to evaluate the environmental pollution caused by improperly treated sewage effluent. However, for this the breadth of sampling points, of the selected parameters such as heavy metals should be wide, so should be the selected physico chemical parameters and nutrients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is NOT suitable. The grammar is incorrect. Proper nouns should start with capital letter. The use of verbs is incorrect. For example it talks about analysis of sewage water. The wordings need improvement. For example sewage water should be replaced with sewage effluent, Therefore, the title needs to be modified into something like this: Determination of levels of organic matter, heavy metals and some physico-chemical parameters in sewage effluent and soil samples taken from selected blocks in Jaipur district of Rajasthan, India	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not complete. First it needs to start by outlining the objective of the research. There is no need to give detail description of the study area or start with description of the study area. There is a mix up in the order in which the abstract is written. It should start with a brief description of the research problem, followed by the objective of the research, then followed by the methodology/method used, then followed by the analysis results and its implication and finally any conclusion and recommendation. In addition, the number of samples in soil and sewage effluents need to be stated separately. When stating the permissible limits of heavy metals, the reference of the National/International standard used needs to be stated. The word etc should not be used in the keyword listing. The key words need to be modified and more appropriate key words should be listed. For example sampling site is too broad and does not specifically identify this paper as sampling sites can be present in wide range of paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Results and discussions should not be given as one combined section. First present the results followed by the discussion of the results and its implication.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>There is a problem with the way the paper is written and the scientific methodology followed in this article. The discussion of faecal matter in the introduction is irrelevant because faecal matter has not been analysed. The introduction need to start with the broader issue of pollution and finally narrow down to the problem existing in the study. However, what is written in the introduction is the contrary. It starts with the narrow problem of the study area and widens to a broader international issue. The introduction is insufficient in terms of reference citation with respect to the parameters studied such as heavy meals, nutrients and physico- chemical parameters in soils and effluents. In general the literature is very shallow.</p> <p>The material and methods needs sub section. First the study area needs to be discussed separately and a map should be provided of the study area showing the location of the sampling stations/points. The number of samples analysed for soils and sewage effluents need to be stated separately. Generally the choice of only nine samples it too shallow. It is a cursory assessment and this should be reflected in the title and abstract. It is not a comprehensive study. The literature mentioned in the material and methods are irrelevant because they do not complement the methodology aspect of the study. They are rather introduction material and if at all should be taken to the introduction section, The method used and the standard operation procedure adopted should be stated for each parameter analysed.</p> <p>The results presented are very shallow. A table and graph should be provided showing clearly the average, maximum and minimum as well as standard deviation of the parameters as well as</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>the location where the samples were taken. This should be done separately for the sewage effluent and the soil. It is difficult to see from table which sample is soil and which sample is sewage. The table caption should be at the top. Table 2 should clearly state which national/International standard was used. The units of the critical limits in table 2 are omitted. The units should be stated otherwise the table is meaningless. There is little or no discussion in the results and discussion section. It is not apparent in terms of graphs and tables if the critical limits are exceeded or not. There is no statistical evaluation to test whether there is significant in the level by which the critical values were exceeded. The conclusion is confusing because the critical limits for sewage effluent and soils are not separately stated. It is difficult to see how conclusion is obtained regarding these separate samples. Nothing has been said about electrical conductivity. It is not clear why organic matter and organic carbon is included in the study. It is also not clear how the soil got contaminated with heavy metals because nothing is said about whether there is a reuse of effluents in agriculture or reuse of sludge from wastewater treatment in agriculture. The more natural pollution is the receiving water courses and this research says nothing about the receiving water courses. It is also not clear what is meant by the word sewage channel. Does it refer to the receiving rivers. There is no standard usage of the word c sewage channel. Domestic sewage is as opposed to storm water is generally transported in pipe sewers and not in channel. If the term sewage channel refers to the receiving water courses/rivers them a wrong and misleading term is being used.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some of the references listed are not cited. For example Ahire (2013), Yusuf(2004).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some grammatical improvements and usage of appropriate words are needed. Refer to the comments above.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article needs significant/major revision in light of the comments provided above.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ababu T. Tiruneh
Department, University & Country	University of Eswatini, Eswatini