

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_130271
Title of the Manuscript:	PARTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF TRACE METALS BETWEEN WATER AND SEDIMENT IN QUA IBOE RIVER, ORUK ANAM, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper will be very useful in the followings It will help in environmental monitoring It will help human health risk assessment It will provide baseline for further research	The manuscript is scientifically suitable for consumption by scientific community.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Assessment of seasonal variations of some heavy metals between water and sediment in Qua Iboe river, Oruk Anam, Nigeria.	The title has been modified to "Assessment of. seasonal variations of some heavy metals between water and sediment in Qua Iboe River, Oruk Anam, Nigeria.
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.	No Some of the background informations should be at the introduction. The concentrations of the heavy metals in both water and sediment should be added. "ASS" in the abstract should be defined. Levels of the metals should be compared with local and international standard organization's permissible limits.	The abstract has been corrected and highlighted. The levels of the metals in the samples were compared with local and international standard organisation's permissible limits.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Is correct	The manuscript is scientifically correct and the data generated will serve as baseline information to other researchers.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but need to confirm to journal's referencing style.	The references have been written in line with journal's referencing style

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	The Language/English quality of the article is suitable for schoalarly communications.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The paper is good, but there should be an improvement for it to reach publishable level.</p> <p>The followings observations might be helpful</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the research should be stated in details.</p> <p>The discussion of the results is weak and is more of comparative with results from literatures.</p> <p>The results should be discussed extensively.Health impacts of high and low levels of the analyzed metals in water and sediment should be stated. The levels of the metals should be compared with permissible limits of standard organizations.</p> <p>The keywords should be arranged in alphabetical order.</p> <p>The contents of tables1and2 should properly arranged.</p> <p>Figure 1 should be written as Figure 2.1.</p> <p>The temperatures at which both sediments and water digested should be stated .</p> <p>"ASS" should be replaced with" ASS"</p> <p>"The level of all trace metals determined in this study were higher in downstream due to increase in the level of anthropogenic activities in the downstream" reference this assumption.</p> <p>" Level of trace metals recorded in dry season were higher than the levels obtained in wet season due to concentration and dilution effect in wet season " reference this assumption.</p> <p>Re- write your conclusion.</p> <p>Check your references and ensure that it is written according to journal`s guidelines.</p> <p>Accept the manuscript, it is publishable subject to the above revisions</p>	Much improvements have been made. The aims and objectives of the research have been clearly stated. The discussion of the results is very reach now because of comparison with local and international permissible standards. Keywords have been arranged in alphabetical order. The contents of Tables 1 and 2 have been properly arranged. In-text references have.been properly done.. Conclusion has been re-written as highlighted..

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