

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_103124
Title of the Manuscript:	POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS, PAHs CONTAMINATION LEVELS AND HEALTH RISKS IN FOODS CONSUMED IN NIGERIA: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are a problem all over the world; as industry and our livelihood depend very much on fossil fuels they can't be avoided. So it's important to study their presence in the environment, to understand how these substances reach environment component and how they affect human and animal health and food quality in order to mitigate their impact on our lives. This study gives a background of research so far in the field for future studies and substantiating solutions to the problem. 2. Yes, the title is suitable; it reflects the contents of the paper. 3. The Abstract correctly summarizes the research review; still the meaning of Margins of Exposure (MOE), computing and interpretation should be explained, here and further in the review. 4. Some more clarity could be added for example by clearly stating which values were detected in water in subchapter 3.2.1 Fish and adding units of measurement for the values detected in fish. Some explanations are also needed on health risk assessment methodology. Also, reference values for PAHs contents in meat should be mentioned in the first commented study. Reference values are also needed for mushrooms as well as computing methodology for carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic health risks. 5. Generally yes, but there are small omissions which I detailed further. 6. As expected for a review paper references are many and recent, most in the time range the authors approached. And they are well cited too. <p>"PAH congeners that possess four or more benzene rings are described as high molecular weight (HMW) PAHs and they include fluoranthene..." – not all the rings in these molecules are benzene rings; for example one of the fluoranthene rings is a cyclopentane. Acronyms and abbreviations should be detailed and explained when they first occur in the text as not everyone who reads the paper is familiar with them; for example in the fourth paragraph of the Introduction: explain what CONTAMP Panel is; the abbreviations of the PAHs (BaA, BaP, etc.) would better appear first when the compounds are mentioned, between brackets next to each one of them. The "Margins of Exposure", "bench mark doses", " carcinogenic toxic equivalents" should be defined, explained, and referenced.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Some language and typing corrections are needed. I think too many words in the text unjustifiably have first capital letters. The phrase "The Margin of Exposure (MOE) based on PAH8 for generally exposed children was less than 10,000 in 25% of Nigerian brands while it was 38% for typically exposed children." needs revising.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Review is well substantiated in the Introduction. Discussions are comprehensive and cover peoples' exposure through diet.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Lungu
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for soil Science, Agrochemistry and Environment, Romania