

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_105083
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of heavy metals in chicken feeds sold in ijebu jesa,Osun state.
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.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, because it deals with a relevant topic for the scientific community</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? No, because it must be modified to Contamination of franc feeds by heavy metals</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, because it addresses the main points of the research</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, overall...</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, as evidence of the research to which it is proposed</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No, especially in the introduction they are very old for the most part.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p>I am very pleased that I reviewed the article, however, I see the need for some improvements on the part of you that I indicate in the body of the article, I see that the work has great potential in relation to a future source of research for the academic community, its importance to the environment.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it's suitable...</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Givanildo de Gois
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Acre, Brazil