

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_122860
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Heavy Metal Concentrations at Ewu-Elepe, Ikorodu Dumpsite, Lagos, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments		Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
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 an interesting topic, but the introduction stage is very shallow and falls to broaden so called title. In the introduction its expected the readers who does not know or have little knowledge on metallic element will be educated little on it, hence the paper loss that value for the prospective reader	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be modified since the study does not cover all the metallic element moreover the study location is so small to address overall metals and metalloids.	
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 content of the work wasn't formidable (first the author falls to clearly indicate if there is prior health or economic or environmental challenge face by resident of the study location that ignite the study.) It's not reasonable to make a guess study hence the abstract need to be improve by adding up highlighted pointed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript has pretty good structure if it can be realigned.	
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	The manuscript results maybe so go however the discussion is very poor. Also, the study falls to affirm it result with relevant existing similar case study. There is no connectivity of the finding with already existing similar study anywhere in the world as the author falls to sort relevant literature to back up his claims.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The reference is not enough that is why the result and discussion statement were not supported references. Also, most of the cited literature are outdated.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is not much language problem if only the author can explore more vocabulary of the related subject matter.	
Optional/General comments	There is need for the authors to do more deep study on the subject matter to better put up a good manuscript that addresses its title holistically or restrain the title to the limit they can better study with concrete result.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Igwe
Department, University & Country	People's Friendship University of Russia, Russia Federation