

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_99922
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicological assessment of potentially toxic element (PTE) contamination, toxicity and related risks in surface water of three tidal creeks of Niger Delta, 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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.Yes. This article is relevant to the society because it indicates the toxicity and pollution load for the river water for common uses. Introduction is extensive and explains the problem briefly. Besides material and methods are presented nicely. 2.Yes 3.Yes 4. Yes 5. May be 6.Yes 7.Only three sampling stations are selected on the river. Hans it is not scientific to predict the water quality on the basis of only three monitoring stations of a river. 8.No year of sampling and frequency of sampling seasonwise is mentioned. Hence the study can't be treated as most authentic on scientific point of view . 9.No WQI values has been mentioned in the table for the monitoring stations.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Language is lucid and almost all error less .	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pratap Kumar Panda
Department, University & Country	A.B. College, India