



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_50475</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Arsenic Content in Different Brands of Rice Sold in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

**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/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Methodology section is poorly written. The sample preparation stages is incomplete such as grade of the acids and other materials used was not mentioned. The reference is missing. Spectroscopic parameters were not mentioned.	This is noted and corrections have been made.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Heating of sample was done in open vessel. As is a volatile inorganic compound so the tendency of losing analyte is high. Could justify not using close vessel method.	The heating was at a low temperature and this was done slowly'
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	As cold vapour is establish method for "As" determination comparison could be highlighted for selected sample. It was mentioned that use of fertiliser and pesticides caused the presence of As in the soil and later transmitted to the plant and grains but no reference was mentioned and the claim was not justified with evidential data.  Should take care of the grammatical error and spelling error	This statement has been recast and the reference supply. Arsenic presence <b>might be</b> adduced to those factors.

**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)	No ethical issues in this work