



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_50475
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Arsenic Content in Different Brands of Rice Sold in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Short 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/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<div>1. In abstract section, unit of arsenic was not indicated.</div> <div>2. When a word is used for the first time, abbreviation should not used. E.g. Arsenic and As.</div> <div>3. In digestion section, what does 1 gm mean?</div> <div>4. In material an method section, there was not indicated any references.</div> <div>5. On table 1, there is not an explanation related to abbreviation form.</div> <div>6. In generally, there is not any explanation about abbreviation.</div> <div>7. In conclusion section, arsenic remediation should be mentioned.</div> <div>8. All references were numbered in all manuscript but in reference section, there is not any number!</div>	<div>1.this has been indicated</div> <div>2.It has been corrected</div> <div>3 .it is what was measured ie 1 gram</div> <div>4 The reference of the methodology is the API-RP 45</div> <div>5. It has been done.</div> <div>6.its been done</div> <div>7. We did not work on soil to warranty arsenic remediation.</div> <div>8.its been done</div>
Optional/General comments		Appreciate these corrections observed. Thanks to the reviewer.

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)	There is no ethical issues.