

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_102461
Title of the Manuscript:	HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT OF TRACE METALS IN WATER, SEDIMENTS AND EDIBLE FISH SPECIES COLLECTED FROM IDU-URUAN BEACH, 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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important for scientific community</p> <p>2. The title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive enough</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate,</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but not too recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><u>Good Research Article.</u></p> <p><u>Suggestions in the manuscript (Check words/sentences in red colour)</u></p> <p>1. In abstract, remove or correct 'were', and do not use abbreviation without first writing in full.</p> <p>Keywords nor enough, use about 4 or 5 keywords</p> <p>2. Series of present and continuous tense in this article. It should completely be in reported form. Some of them to be adjusted are highlighted in red colour.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olushola Olorunfemi Eseyin
Department, University & Country	Institute of Natural Resources, Environment and Sustainable Development, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria