



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_44307
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METALS CONTAMINATION AND POTENTIAL HUMAN HEALTH RISK VIA CONSUMPTION OF VEGETABLES FROM SELECTED COMMUNITIES IN ONELGA, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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

PPART 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 11: replace "comma" with "and" agricultural activities Line 12: the word "accumulated" is more suitable than "absorbed", replace it. Line 31: Arsenic is better than symbol "As" at the start of the sentence in this case. Line 37: Separate Food safety with a comma, THQ is not necessary. Line 46: "can pose as a", "as" should be deleted. Line 50: Correct process to processes. Line 51: Correct human to humans. Line 54: hyphenate half-lives i.e (half-lives). Line 57: check excess spacing after 11,12. Line 102: You mean 2 ml could digest 5g sample successfully? Or is it 20ml? After line106, you need to state how the elemental metals were analyzed after digestion by stating the instrument, its model and possibly the wavelength of absorption before the risk assessment. After line 182, under EDI, Please separate the name of the community from the word "community" with the space bar and italicise some omitted botanical names. The citations FDA,2001 and Garcia-Rico,2007 under Tables 2 & 3 were not cited properly with number representation and were not included in References. Does ONELGA stands for Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni LGAs or it is an LGA on its own in Rivers State? Pls clarify that name for good identity. No conclusion? Is there no need? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The corrections made in lines 11, 12, 31 and 37 were mainly suitable words to be used and they have been effected and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. These corrections were made in the "abstract" section. The corrections made in lines 46, 50, 51, 54 and 57 were mainly suitable words to be used and they have been effected and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. These corrections were mention in the "introduction" section. The correction made in line 102 was accepted but it was actually digested with 2 ml and not 20 ml as Reviewer has thought. A similar research was referenced to clarify that. This correction was made in the "Materials and methods" section. The correction made in line 106 which required authors to state how the elemental metals were analyzed after digestion by stating the instrument, its model and possibly the wavelength of absorption before the risk assessment. These corrections were also effected by stating how the metals were analysed and also the instrument used. The correction made in line 182, under EDI , the name of the community was separated from the word community and effected in the manuscript , highlighted in yellow. The citations FDA,2001 and Garcia-Rico,2007 under Tables 2 & 3 were not cited properly with number representation and were not included in References. This correction has been effected by citing them with number representation and were included in the references as corrected. Does ONELGA stands for Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni LGAs or it is an LGA on its own in Rivers State? Pls clarify that name for good identity. ONELGA stands for Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni LGA and it is an LGA on its own in Rivers State. It has been clearly stated and highlighted with yellow in the "Materials and methods" section. . No conclusion? Is there no need? This correction has also been effected and highlighted in yellow in the "Conclusion" section.
Minor REVISION comments	The references should be formatted to the Journal's standard or guidelines. The editor should verify that.	The references have been formatted to the Journal's standard or guidelines. They were all highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.
Optional/General comments	It would not be a bad idea if a statistical software was used to analyze the data, though not compulsory. On the whole, the paper is a good one and it is publishable with minor corrections like those listed above.	Your thoughts and suggestions are well and high appreciated . Thank You.

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)	No ethical issues in this manuscript.