

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_82485
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION AND EVALUATION OF HEAVY METAL CONCENTRATION IN SURFACE WATER AND SEDIMENT FROM ORASHI RIVER IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Dissemination of environmental data

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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The general references used in the introductions are too old. These must be replaced by modern works.</p> <p>The figure describing the site is way below standard. This must be optimized.</p> <p>The data in graphs does not have UNITS!!!</p> <p>Data for the sampling site is incomplete. Data on temperature (water and atmospheric) must be included. Other relevant site details would be welcomed (air velocity, naval traffic, water velocity, etc.) to enriched the study.</p> <p>Analysis is weak. An effort should be made to enrich conclusions. The discussion of the relationships between sediment and water values is missing; perhaps some efforts on speciation and solubility (therefore, the importance of temperature) would enrich the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I have taken the liberty to write some comments on the paper itself, to suggest minor revisions, that might, IMHO, enrich the paper and its comprehension.</p> <p>The author states, several times, that sediment has higher metal's concentration than water phase. This, IMHO, is obvious; therefore, state how could this not be so and why is it a finding in your case.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This work is valuable because it provides actual data, on a real system. All empirical and experimental data is valuable. Obviously, there is also value in the meaning of such data and this is where the authors might transform a data work into a more fundamental contribution. The lines I could humbly suggest, would include modelling the chemistry, review the air and water flow patterns that refresh (modify, wash) the concentrations along the year or other, more local and specific phenomena.</p>	

[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:	Leandro Herrera-Zeppelin
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Chile, Chile