

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_102887
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatio-Temporal Variation in Heavy metals Concentration in Benthic Sediment of Qua Iboe River Estuary, South-South, Nigeria.
Type of the 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.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the topic addressed is of the utmost importance to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate to the reality of the topic.</p> <p>3. Yes, or sum up the article, cover the objectives for the purpose of the research</p> <p>4. Yes, appropriate to the purpose of the investigation</p> <p>5. Yes, handwritten and scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent and scientifically correct.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>SIM, the quality of the language is adequate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is well written and will be a great contribution to science.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Givanildo De Gois
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Acre, Brazil