

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_84849
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METALS CONCENTRATION AND ARTHROPOD POPULATION IN SOME SELECTED DUMPSITES FROM CALABAR, CROSS RIVER 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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Major Revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author should revise the whole manuscript carefully. 2. Abstract is not clear about Author's work. 3. Abstract should include some information regarding topic and statement problem. 4. It is recommended to polish the grammatical problem by professional English editing organizations. 5. Revise Keywords 6. All abbreviation should be used as full form before, it will be easier for readers to understand such as Cd, Pb, Cr, Ni, Co, As and Hg 7. Author should check correct format i.e 0.144°C. and 0.055 °C (It should have space in all or all without spaces) 8. Material and method section is not clearly explain. Study area should be explained i.e climate 9. There are several new studies have been conducted. Author should cite them in introduction part. New related work or references should be used in this paper (within5-8 years). 10. Fig 1 is not clear. 11. Author should give recommendations for future in different section than conclusion. 12. Conclusion is not enough, Author should explain briefly. 13. There are mistakes in tables, author should revise. 14. Introduction part is not enough and author has not given statement that what work did he do and why ? 15. The more important is that author should emphasize shortcomings of previous reviews, highlight the innovation of this manuscript, and the supplement to the lack of previous research. 16. Author should apply more statistical analysis 17. All tables and figures should also be mentioned in text. 18. All instruments and apparatus which are used in this study, they should be mentioned in the section MATERIALS AND METHOD. 19. All species should be used in italic text. 20. In result discussion part, author has given result but the proportion of chapters in the manuscript needs to be adjusted. 21. Author should give some comparative graphs. 22. In discussion section, all parts should be discussed in details separately such as with graphical representation. Most of readers do not read but they check graphical results 23. There are many incomplete sentences. There are many such sentences, I cannot mention all there. We may say, Whole paper should be revised with the help of English expert. <p>Author's study is appreciable but it needs perfect revision before publishing</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author should revise the title (if possible) 2. Author should provide doi id in references so that readers may find references easily. 3. Put digital coordinates also 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Manzoor Ahmed Sanjrani
Department, University & Country	HANDS-Institute of Development Studies, Pakistan