



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_45932
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Heavy Metals in Young, Matured and Aged Leaves of Moringa Spetenopetala Tree Using Flame Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy in South Ethiopia
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The following points should be considered while revising the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The aim of the study is not clear. The purpose of the present study should be mentioned.</li> <li>2. In the section 'Introduction'. The description of the plant should be shortened and purpose of the study should be highlighted.</li> <li>3. In the section 'Discussion' term Discussion should be used instead of Discussions.</li> <li>4. The concentration values of metals should be avoided in the section 'Discussion'. Only the results should be discussed along with citation of literature.</li> <li>5. The reason for difference in metal concentrations with age of the tissue should be explained.</li> </ol>	<p>All the comments have been appreciated by Authors</p> <p>Appreciating all the comments 1 and 2, we have tried to intensify the purpose of the study by shortening description of the tree.</p> <p>Comment 3 is well taken comment. Thank you</p> <p>For comments 3. We only left result that can add value of ideas for readers by eliminating most of them. In case of comment 4, appreciating the comments, relevance of the idea to the purpose of the paper is considered by including little ideas concerning the variation of the metals as the age progresses. It could be seen in other studies.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There is no ethical issue.