SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_47832
	HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT FOR CARCINOGENIC AND NON-CARCINOGENIC HEAVY METAL EXPOSURES FROM PEPPER FRUITS CULTIVATED IN KATSINA STATE, NORTH WEST NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
	In the abstract the last sentence is repeated. Line 24: fruits and vegetables not fruit vegetables Line 25: therefore not there-fore Line 50: ready for use not ready for used Line 80: the individual heavy metals in vegetable and fruit species not the individual heavy metals or vegetable and fruit species Line 148: obtained not obtain Line 153: fall not falls The paragraph from line 161 to 168 is repeated (mentioned before). In table 1, the abbreviation BDL should be clarified in complete words below the table (Below detection level). Line 205: You mentioned that Cd and Pb are classified by the IARC as being carcinogenic agents (Use another reference as the mentioned one does not include IARC classification of Pb and Cd). Line 304: you mentioned reference with page number from 32345 to 0. I think there is a mistake.	
Optional/General comments	Can you provide more descriptive information of the inhabitants: total number, percentage of adults and children?	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dalia Abdel-Hamid Shaker
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)