



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_52546
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Selected Heavy Metals Concentration in Animal Feeds
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The study is not new, but interesting and with potential as long as some changes are considered that may make it more robust. I have directly indicated minor comments in the text in changes mode, however the authors suggest reviewing conclusions, which should contain only the main findings and future perspectives in the research field, without describing the results in detail. Other changes are required as specified in the comments below.</p> <p>I believe there is some relevant information missing as the justification for why these four metals were chosen and what is the acceptable concentration limit in world law or which concentration was used as a comparison?</p> <p>The study has no hypothesis (the hypothesis is usually expected for an article presented in a scientific journal like this).</p> <p>In the summary the maximum value found for cadmium metal is not consistent with the values described in the table, in the summary it is described that the highest value found for cadmium is 0.15ppm and the table is 0.49ppm.</p> <p>In the result and conclusion section, the average values found are described and are not consistent with the average values calculated from the table data, the average values calculated from the data described in the table are: 0.57ppm As; 0.10ppm Cd; 0.09ppm Hg and 1.61Pb.</p> <p>The article has no statistics performed, and there is potential for performing descriptive statistical analysis. However, in the discussion comparison is made with other authors using terms such as "significantly larger" terms which require statistical analysis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Data can be better presented using graphs or summarizing values in the table that refer to the same sample using mean values.	
Optional/General comments	<p>There was no validation of method and chemical analysis, nor equipment calibration information.</p> <p>There are some non-current references cited as dated 1999, I believe there are new replaceable references.</p>	

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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gabriela Cristina Rabello Casagrande</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidade Federal De Mato Grosso, Brazil</i>