



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

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>Line 14: The objective is vague; it does not corroborate the topic. The concentration of heavy metals cannot be evaluated through consumption of food or vegetable as the authors mentioned. However, human health risk could be assessed via food consumption. The author should therefore set their objectives right to buttress the content of the work.</p> <p>Line 25: The authors reported that the concentrations of Pb, Cd, Cu and Ni exceeded the limits of WHO/FAO, EC/CODEX, JECFA and NAFDAC respectively. However, Table 1 does not corroborate this claim:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's obvious that authors compared the limits with average concentration and not just concentration as written, 2. Not all average concentrations exceeded the limits as claimed. For instance, average Cu (29.3 mg/kg) was lower than JECFA (40 mg/kg) and mean Pb (1.57 mg/kg) was also lower than WHO/FAO (2 mg/kg) as shown in Table 1 <p>The conclusion depicts that authors are not confident of their results. Authors should use firmer words, having conducted the research and performed their calculations.</p> <p>Line 37: The keywords are confusing. Please review and use punctuations appropriately.</p> <p>Table 1: The footnote under Table 1 is inappropriate. Also, authors did not need to use as much number of standard limits. Comparing with one international and one national standard limits is enough. However, it is at their discretion to compare their results with limits they want but should be put in the table appropriately. See tables in published papers for guidance. Also, the two lines under Table 2 are inappropriate.</p> <p>I could not find the conclusion of this work. The authors should please give the summary of the research conducted.</p> <p>The whole work was written without paragraphs. Kindly review and present your research in a suitable manner</p> <p>No Quality assurance/control measure to ensure the accuracy or precision of the analytical processes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The correction made on line 14 on the objective as vague has been corrected and effected in the manuscript highlighted in yellow 2. The authors reported that the concentrations of Pb, Cd, Cu and Ni exceeded the limits of WHO/FAO, EC/CODEX, JECFA and NAFDAC respectively. However, Table 1 does not corroborate this claim. This has been revised, corrected accordingly and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript, it was really appreciated as it was a mistake that has to be corrected by revising the manuscript. 3. It's obvious that authors compared the limits with average concentration and not just concentration as written. This has been corrected as the limits were compared with the concentrations of metals and not the average concentrations per say. 4. Not all average concentrations exceeded the limits as claimed. For instance, average Cu (29.3 mg/kg) was lower than JECFA (40 mg/kg) and mean Pb (1.57 mg/kg) was also lower than WHO/FAO (2 mg/kg) as shown in Table 1. This was revised again due the correction pointed out by reviewer and authors clearly identify that it was a mistake, the corrections were effected and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. 5. The conclusion depicts that authors are not confident of their results. Authors should use firmer words, having conducted the research and performed their calculations. This correction was also made in the result and conclusion sections as authors tried using firmer words to describe the results. 6. The keywords are confusing. Please review and use punctuations appropriately. This correction made in line 37 was accepted and revised accordingly after which corrections were made in the keywords and effected in the manuscript 7. The footnote under Table 1 is inappropriate. Also, authors did not need to use as much number of standard limits. Comparing with one international and one national standard limits is enough. However, it is at their discretion to compare their results with limits they want but should be put in the table appropriately. See tables in published papers for guidance. Also, the two lines under Table 2 are inappropriate. This correction made in these tables were corrected and effected in the tables. The footnoted were removed and effected in the manuscript appropriately 8. I could not find the conclusion of this work. The authors should please give the summary of the research conducted. The conclusion section has been effected in the manuscript and highlighted in yellow. Authors really appreciated this as it is very important in every manuscripts. 9. The whole work was written without paragraphs. Kindly review and present your research in a suitable manner. The manuscript has been revised and agreed with the correction made on the paragraphing . This has therefore been effected in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 10: Oil “exploration” is better suited than “exploitation”</p> <p>Line 10-13: Authors should use conjunctions where appropriate to make sentences more understandable</p> <p>Line 18: “Comprising” goes without “of” (“consist of” can be used)</p> <p>Line 19-20 Solar Thermo Elemental is merely the model of your equipment and should not form acronym with AAS. Flame AAS is known as F-AAS only. The model would be included in section 2 (materials and method) of main work.</p> <p>Line 22: “mean concentrations and (range)” should rather be presented as “mean concentrations and range (in bracket)”</p> <p>Line 28: Authors should be able to distinguish between estimated daily intake (EDI) and concentration and not to use them interchangeably.</p> <p>Line 31: Authors should always start a sentence with the first word in full. E.g. instead of “As concentration exceeded...” please use “Arsenic concentration exceeded...”</p> <p>Line 41: Reference format is inappropriate, kindly follow the journal's format.</p> <p>Line 76: Always ensure appropriate spacing</p> <p>Line 77: The coordinates are not well presented. Kindly correct.</p> <p>Line 101: SI unit of volume is L; thus mL is more appropriate. The acids should be well written: H₂SO₄, HNO₃</p> <p>Line 102, 135: Always separate units from figures e.g. 5 g or 10 mL</p> <p>Line 150: The “ing” should be a subscript</p> <p>Line 153: Appropriate spacing is required</p> <p>Line 170: “BDL <0.001” is not appropriate. The detection limit should be stated at the beginning, so that any value below it would be regarded as BDL (below detection limit). The authors should replace “BDL <0.001” appropriately in the whole work.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corrections made in lines 10, 10 – 13, 18,19 – 20, 22, 28, 31, 41, 76, 77,101, 102, 150, 153, and 170 were agreed and accepted by authors. The corrections on the suitable and appropriate words to use were effected and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. 2. Authors also distinguish between EDI and concentration and corrected and effected that in the manuscript highlighted in yellow. 3. The references were corrected and formatted to the Journal guidelines. 4. The coordinates were also put in the standard format. 5. The SI unit of volume is L , that was also corrected , effected and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript . 6. As mentioned by the reviewer in line 101, it was corrected and effected in the manuscript highlighted in yellow. 7. As mentioned in line 135 , the units were separated from the figures and corrected accordingly. This was effected accordingly and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. 8. The “ing” in the CSFing was corrected and put in a subscript and in the manuscript. 9. The spacing of the manuscript was revised and corrected accordingly. 10. The frequent use of the BDL <0.001 in the whole manuscript were corrected and effected appropriately.
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors should go through the author's pack for this journal, in order to follow the pattern of referencing, citation, tables and figures presentation etc.</p> <p>Authors should review the paper thoroughly as there are a lot of avoidable error in the work.</p>	<p>The references and citations have been formatted to the format of the journal. Authors genuinely appreciates the effort of this wonderful team of reviewers. Thank You.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>