



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_63570
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metal and Microbial Contaminants of Some Vegetables Irrigated With Goo Reservoir Water, Navrongo, Ghana.
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: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract – suitable</b></p> <p>1. Summarize the abstract generally to carry information of the aim of study, study design, methodology, results and conclusion instead of writing them in distinctive headings of aims, study design, methodology, results and conclusion). You can download a publish paper from this journal as a guide.</p> <p>2. Yellow shades in some portions are for rephrasing (avoid use of the word WE).</p> <p>3. Abbreviations use for the first time is to be written in full then subsequently abbreviated.(they have been captured in yellow shades)</p> <p><b>Introduction - suitable</b></p> <p>1. Inconsistency in your referencing style was noticed and has been indicated in yellow shades. Also a red shade seen in this chapter is for more clarity because they portray the same content information.</p> <p><b>Methodology – suitable</b></p> <p><b>Results – suitable</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sample sizes not captured</li> <li>2. No relevant statistics is captured</li> </ol> <p><b>Overall evaluation of paper-</b> paper is technically sound, clearly written and organized</p> <p><b>Figures and Tables</b> are suitable and OK</p> <p><b>Bibliography/References:-</b> some were written according to authors guidelines. Check some of the references for pages and if possible for corrections and inclusion e.g</p> <p><b>1. USEPA,1999 &amp; WHO, 1989 – Not available at the reference pages.</b> <b>Reference 12 ; 22; &amp; 42 could not be seen in the main body of the work.</b></p> <p>2. Stick to one referencing style, suggested words for corrections were indicated in yellow shades.E.g Orisakwe et al (2012) does not conform with your reference style</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>A minor based error has been corrected. In addition, some suggested corrections are indicated in yellow shades for rephrasing.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Well enriched work and adequately articulated.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Achide Samson</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nigeria</b>