



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
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>)



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>-In all scientific names the species has that you are with lower case letter, example: <i>Moringa Stenopetela</i> change by <i>Moringa stenopetela</i>.</p> <p>-In the part of digestion of samples (lines 95-99) the authors say that they passed the samples through a sieve of 2 mm. I believe they should have been ground after drying, please explain the methodology better.</p> <p>- I believe that the authors could not measure Cr and Pb because they digested 1 gram of plant leaves and took it to a volume of 100 mL, the concentrations of these elements in plants can be close to a few micrograms per gram of dry weight. The authors by using a volume of 100 mL in the final dilution, makes it impossible for them to observe these elements by the AAS technique. If the authors work with a smaller volume (e.g. 50 mL) and digest more plant material (e.g. 3-5 gr), they could observe Cr and Pb. When digesting plant material the effect of the matrix (where there are elements with high concentrations, for example: Na, Ca, K, S) produces that the limits of detection and quantification are greater than those that we can have when we work with standard solutions.</p> <p>-Line 109, the AAS mark would be missing, (Buck).</p> <p>-Line 116 change ($P \leq 0.05$) to ($p \leq 0.05$).</p> <p>-Authors should work only with significant decimals, for example in Table 1: Cu value: 1.4676 ± 0.017 change to: 1.47 ± 0.02. They should do this for all manuscript data.</p> <p>- Line 218, add well the citation of Ali et al.</p> <p>- The authors only make a descriptive study of the results obtained, the elements that used Fe, Cu, and Zn participate in many coenzymes involved in the physiology of the plant, so the results found in the different stages of growth could be related to this. They could make a better discussion of the results obtained.</p>	<p>Authors appreciate your professional comments and tried to include all the necessary comments. Almost all the comments have been agreed to be incorporated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First comment is well taken <p>Yes, samples were converted to powders before sieving and we included.</p> <p>Acknowledging your comments, Small quantity may contribute. But future works may be considered here. We have indicated in discussion for that.</p> <p>Authors understood this comment to include the abbreviation FAAS</p> <p>Well taken</p> <p>All data are maintained to your comments</p> <p>Well taken</p> <p>Authors appreciated this comment and tried to say little. But as per the relevance the idea to the work is taken into consideration.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There is no ethical issue.