



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_50298
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METAL CONTENT IN AFRICAN GIANT RAT (<i>Cricetomys gambianus</i>)
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	The manuscript was well designed and well written. However, the authors need to edit the entire manuscript. The abstract should be revised; all superscripts in data should be removed. The introduction was written well but needs editing. Old literature works were cited by the authors, with the exception of few ones. More recent works should be cited to improve the manuscript.	I agreed with the reviewer comments. However, figures 1, 2 and 3 can still be do away with from the study and has been removed completely. The manuscript has been re-written and all necessary adjustment have been made.
Minor REVISION comments	The conclusion could be improved and the current conclusion is too simplistic.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	