

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_106363
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METALS ON AFRICAN CATFISH (CLARIAS GARIEPINUS) FROM SOME FISH PONDS IN EMENE, ENUGU STATE, SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA
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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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>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>The article presents the research of different heavy metal accumulation in pond fishes depending on the pond. The metals (Pb, Cd, Cr, Cu, Zn, and Fe) were detected by AAS. This article is of interest for the community working on metal toxins in food especially in fish.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript seems to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>Additional references could enrich the article</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Why mercury was not measured in the fish, as it should also be a toxic metal.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uta Schnabel
Department, University & Country	Leibniz Institute for Plasma Science and Technology, Germany