

[Ρεσπεκ Φορμ 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_96232
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METAL CONTAMINANTS IN POPULARLY-CONSUMED VEGETABLES IN FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE.
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.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> 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>The manuscript looks original and important for the scientific community.</p> <p>Title is appropriate in the manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract is good but needs some revision and English with grammatical errors should be remove.</p> <p>Structure and subsections are good but guidelines have not been followed.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is correct.</p> <p>References are enough but should be added more recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are numerous grammatical errors should be checked in Grammarly software.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The coordinates of the study area are given wrong. Author should rewrite the coordinates in Decimal degree or any other format.</p> <p>It is essential for any research paper or manuscript. The location map must be given or research plot should narrate the study area.</p> <p>It is suggested to authors develop flow chart of methodology about the steps taken in the research.</p> <p>Tables have no caption. It should be captioned when given table number or figure number.</p> <p>The references should be recent from 2020 to 2022 if it is possible.</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>	

[Ρεσπεκτο Φορμ 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shoukat Ali Shah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wuhan University, China</b>