



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_51136
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Heavy Metal Levels in Offal Meats (Kidney And Liver) Of Beef Sold at Gwagwalada Market, Abuja, 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>)



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The research work was good and informative to the profession. But there are some places the author have to touch in order to have a wonderful work.</p> <p>1) Abstract: under Aim: To determine the concentrations of heavy metal (Cd,Fe,Pd, and Zn) residues in kidney and liver of slaughtered cattle</p> <p>2) Introduction: the work was excellently presented but the references was not properly numbered. Examples- reference no 4 came before reference no 3, this is not suppose to be so. Reference no 4-6 was numbered in this manner, i don't know if it's no (4,6) or (5,6). Then reference no 5 was omitted. Also there should be a unique method of writing two references together. Eg in reference no13 and 14 the author put it like this (13-14) but the proper way is (13,14).The author must try to mantain one sytle of documentation, since number was used all through the text, while using both number and words on reference no 22.</p> <p>3) Discussion: reference no 33 was omitted.</p> <p>4) References: the references was well arranged just that a total number of 44 references was cited in the work but only 43 reflected on the references list.</p>	Thank you for the thorough review. I agreed on the issues flagged and have effected all the corrections accordingly.
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>	All authors hereby declare that "principles of laboratory animal care" (NIH publication no. 85-23, revised 1985) were followed, as well as specific national laws where applicable. All experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee"