



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_49786
Title of the Manuscript:	HEALTH RISK ANALYSIS OF HEAVY METALS (Cr, Fe, Hg & Ni) IN EDIBLE VEGETABLES IN YALA URBAN AREA OF CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors submitted an original type of paper, which deals with an interesting topic. The authors investigated concentrations of selected heavy metals in the soil and vegetables planted in Nigeria during the rain and dry periods. The used analytical method was flame atomic absorption spectrophotometer. The authors prepared the samples properly and used adequate methods.</p> <p>However, the authors already publische pard of the results for Fe and Cr conentartion in another journal. http://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/article/view/30105/56480 Therefor, I do not understand the innovative point of this manuscript.</p>	<p>I think the Reviewer is mixing the results of my previous article published in CSIJ Journal with this current one. I considered Cd, Co, Cr and Fe in an entirely different urban area from this one.</p> <p>In this current article, Cr, Fe, Hg and Ni were considered in an entirely different urban area. Besides, the values of Cr and Fe are different entirely just as the locations are different. So, the manuscript is innovative and novel.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors did not cite the refences correctly in the text, e.g. line 55 and 197.</p> <p>The description of tables 1 and 2 do not correspond with the content of the tables. Where are the results for Co and Cd?</p>	<p>Co and Cd were not included in this study. So, why should they be described or discussed here. PLEASE check the title.</p> <p>References in line 55 and 197 shall be corrected.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript requires extensive revision.</p>	<p>I disagree because the Reviewer mix the results the our two articles up instead of reviewing the current article given to him or her.</p>



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	