

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105754
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of heavy metal concentrations in food samples of oil and non-oil producing communities in Rivers State.
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>It is an article that gives an idea of the problem of environmental pollution.</p> <p>Yes, this title is suitable.</p> <p>In the abstract only mention the results without the standard deviations. Mention if there were statistical differences between the samples analyzed.</p> <p>Yes, the structure the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>No. Modifications must be made in terms of scientific terms.</p> <p>The number of references is fine.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the summary only mention the results without the standard deviations. Mention if there were statistical differences between the samples analyzed.</p> <p>Throughout the text, modify the citations with [] and the period at the end of the citation, not before.</p> <p>The methodology should be reworded because only some samples are mentioned, leaving the aquatic samples unmentioned. And if these samples underwent the same procedure for their chemical analysis.</p> <p>In the results and discussion, many data already mentioned in the Tables should be omitted. They should focus only on discussing the statistical differences and their relevance to the results.</p> <p>Review all the bibliographic references throughout the text since some of them are not numbered. There is no sequence in the numbering of citations in the text. They should be revised.</p> <p>This article may be published when suggestions for modifications are carried out.</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:	María Elena Carranco Jáuregui
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubiran, Mexico