



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_63151
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metals Content of Common Tubers from Selected Farm Locations in Enugu North District, South East, 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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results should be presented in mean±SD and the order of metal concentrations presented only as < or > signs without figures. • All the results should be presented at this section • WHO appears first on this section and should be written in full. • China SEPA standard was also used in the work and should be included on this section. • The last sentence should be recast for better understanding. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The digestion method (wet or...) used in this study should be mentioned and explained • Under sample digestion the figures attached to the chemical names should be written in subscripts and temperature degree as superscript. • Description of the use of atomic absorption spectrophotometer should be briefly made and the mathematical calculation used to obtain elements final concentration should be stated. <p>Results and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results should be presented in mean±SD and the order of metal concentrations presented only as < or > signs without figures. • Units should be separated from the figures • “these values were far below the WHO permissible limit” should be written as “these values were below WHO permissible limits”. • More recent works are required to discuss the results at this section. • Data analysis used should be stated on this section. <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More recent references are recommended • Ref. [1] should be consistent with others • Ref. [8] date should be 2008 not with “b” for there is no “a” on the reference list. • Ref. [13] and [14] dates should be revisited. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The third paragraph and the fifth line “the body cause...” should rather be “the body causes...” And the sixth line “lead presents the liver... (USEPA)” should be recast for better understanding. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “However, risk assessment of chromium intake through the consumption of these tubers is required to ascertain the level of human exposure to chromium in the study area” should rather be “However, risk assessment of chromium intake through the consumption of these tubers is recommended to ascertain the level of human exposure to chromium in the study area”. 	

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:	<i>Odangowei Inetiminebi Ogidi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria</i>