



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_50179
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of health risk associated with heavy metal contamination of edible vegetables in cement contaminated area.
Type of the Article	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	The abstract was not written well. In the abstract results, let the authors include heavy metal values obtained to improve the quality and scientific basis of the manuscript. The introduction was too short, let the authors improved the introduction by adding new materials from recent publications. The authors only showed tables for the results, some of the values are needed in the results section to improve the scientific value of the manuscript, therefore let the authors include some of these data. The data, although contained standard deviations, the ANOVA were not included and the degree of variation not stated. The authors should separate the means and state this at the footnote of the tables.	We estimated the levels of 9 heavy metals in 7 different edible vegetables, including the values of heavy metals obtained in the abstract will make it to exceed the word count required for an abstract by the journal. Including the values on the tables again on the result section may amount to repetition. The journal instructions stipulated that we should avoid repetition.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The authors should compare their results in the discussion section standards set set by the various regulatory bodies.	This correction has been effected
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	