

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_97748
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF MINING ACTIVITIES ON SOME BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS OF OPANDA-UGYA INHABITANTS, TOTO LOCAL GOVERNMENT OF 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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Clear</b></p> <p><b>The statement made in abstract are <u>not</u> as per the conclusions drawn under Table 4.</b></p> <p><b>Results are not properly discussed.</b></p> <p><b>Need improvement, definitely.</b></p> <p><b>References are more than sufficient. Can be reduced.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	It is ok	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>No comments found on Table 1.</p> <p>Whether it was a hypothesis that the water samples from Mines should contain higher level of heavy metals.</p> <p>The data show water samples being collected from 3 sites with 7 samples. The data could have presented in two ways: First, to show the average of all the 7 samples and compare it with WHOL and then comment whether it is higher or lower. Second, to show that in more samples, the levels are higher as compared to WHOL.</p> <p>Table 3: In controls there are 20 subjects, then why a single figure and not Mean+/- SD is shown for Liver function?</p> <p>Table 4: Again, single figure is shown against controls, why?</p> <p>Table 5: What is the meaning of exponents a,b,c? It is not clear? Does this represent the significance level, especially when creatinine and urea levels are mentioned to be comparable and are within normal range?</p> <p>However, in discussion, it is discussed as though the urea levels are found to be significantly different from that of control.</p> <p>The paper need revision in the light of the above comments.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ramnath Takiar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>