



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_48273
Title of the Manuscript:	Health risk and heavy metal assessment in selected vegetables together with soils in Minjingu village-Tanzania using WDXRF technique
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	The manuscript described "Health risk and heavy metal assessment in selected vegetables together with soils in Minjingu village-Tanzania using WDXRF technique". From the abstract the paper do not consider heavy metals of importance such as lead, mercury etc. Most of the trace elements considered had little health risks when compared with lead, mercury etc. Let the authors consider this.	-Changed to "Assessment of health risk and elemental concentrations in Minjingu Vegetables and soils by Wavelength Dispersive X-ray by Fluorescence" -It is now addressing the elements analysed by our machine according to their presence
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript cited old references. Authors should cite recent literatures 2016-2019 for current updates. The manuscript needs complete editing. The conclusion is too long and authors should not repeat the results of study. The abstract should be able to summarize this.	- I have added more recent literatures 2016-2019. - Thank you
Optional/General comments	Most of data in the tables do not have ANOVA and standard deviation. Authors should provide them as these will make the data robust.	- I have made the changes

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	I agree with reviewer's comments