

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_92592
Title of the Manuscript:	DISTRIBUTION AND HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METALS IN TISSUES OF CALLINECTES SAPIDUS FROM IKO RIVER, AKWA IBOM 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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

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	Please refer to the general comments section for details.	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical and typo errors.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper presents concentration of heavy metals in water and Callinectes Capidus at two sites in Iko River of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria. The results show high human risk assessment, making the Iko River unsafe for consumption. The following comments are for the authors of the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper should be checked carefully for grammatical errors. 2. The contribution of the paper is not apparent in the introduction. 3. The geographical map of Nigeria, Akwa Ibom state and Iko River, where the research was conducted are required in Section 2.1 of this paper. 4. There is no typical or realistic topology, apparatus or experimental setup or flow chart of the study to help bring out its scientific contribution and its replication before the results and discussion section. 5. The apparatus, components, and their ratings (or how the values were obtained) should be clearly described in the paper. 6. The chemistry and physics of the action of the heavy metals, the physico-chemical analysis and their effect on the environment should be clearly explained. 7. The authors claimed that their result is quite different from those obtained in Reference [17] on metal accumulation in male and female species. This should be proven by graphically plotting both studies based on available data. 	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kenneth Okedu
Department, University & Country	National University, Oman