

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_104741
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metals Identification and Detection in Incinerated Bottom Ash from Biomedical Solid Waste in Selected Healthcare Facilities in Douala, Cameroon.
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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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? 5.</p> <p>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The article addresses a very interesting topic for public health and for the present, which deserves and should be increasingly investigated.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate and coherent with the development of the article</p> <p>3. Well-structured and reflecting the content of the article, it deserved greater balance between the parts.</p> <p>4. The article presents the appropriate structure with a well-founded and sequential Introduction with a clear indication of the objective of the study, methodologically objective, the results respond to the defined objective and the discussion and conclusion depart from these. the use of acronyms is extensive and they do not always follow the rules. Well written</p> <p>5. Methodologically consistent. I would suggest clarifying the obtaining of the sample under study for a better understanding.</p> <p>6. The list of bibliographical references is extensive and pertinent, but little updated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Well written	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matilde Delmina da Silva Martins
Department, University & Country	School of Health, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal