

Review Form 3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofFisheriesandAquaticResearch
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJFAR_125557
TitleoftheManuscript:	BioaccumulationofHeavyMetalsinOrgansofClariasgariepinusJuvenilesExposedtoSub-LethalConcentrationsofWasteTireResidues
TypeoftheArticle	ResearchPaper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This is a virtuous piece of work however, I would like to remark on this manuscript (Ms_AJFAR_125557) entitled as "Bioaccumulation of Heavy Metals in Organs of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> Juveniles Exposed to Sub-Lethal Concentrations of Waste Tire Residues"</p> <p>However it needs improvement for publishing in the journal. My final recommendation on this manuscript is "accept after a major revision". Authors highlighted a description of the effect of heavy metals of waste burnt tire residues on the <i>Clarias gariepinus</i>.</p> <p><i>Detailed reviewer query and suggestions attached in Annexure-I (Report_Reviewer)</i></p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title of the manuscript was vague and it should be revised with relevance to focusing of the work. Author may replace with the more relevant titles: "Analyses of Bioaccumulation of Heavy metals on the Organs of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> following Exposure of Sub-lethal Concentrations of Waste tire residues"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract should be concise and highlight aim, methods, results and the main outcomes. Abstract may be restructure as follows:-</p> <p>"This study evaluated certain heavy metals concentrations of waste burnt tire residues (WBTRs) and bioaccumulation of these heavy metals in the certain organ systems (viz-gills, liver, kidney and muscles) of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> following exposure to sublethal concentrations (SLCs) of water-soluble fractions (WSFs) of WBTRs. <i>C. gariepinus</i> (average weight of 47.95±0.34g and length of 15.54±0.36cm) were exposed to SLCs of different concentrations (0.00, 0.23, 0.47, 0.94, 1.87, and 3.74 ppm) of WSFs of WBTRs for a period of fifty-eight days. Heavy metal concentrations in WBTRs and in the organs of the experimental fish were measured using a handheld X-Ray Fluorescence Analyzer (Niton XL3T). Results showed that strontium, lead, zinc, cobalt, bismuth, rubidium, gold, tungsten, iron, thorium, arsenic, copper, and niobium were detected in WBTRs although the maximum level of zinc was perceived. However, no significant difference was observed as compared to the control group regarding heavy metal accumulation in muscles, 53.10±12.78; liver, 56.30±76.96; kidney, 164.54±12.78; and gills, 241.36±146.87 of fish, (<i>P</i> > 0.05). The high heavy metal concentrations present in WBTRs are really concerned as having the capacity to pollute surrounding environments with the aquatic ecosystem through sewage flow and rain water effluents. Upon regular consumption of fishes from aquatic body with WBTRs also caused the pathogenic impact on the other fauna including human beings."</p> <p>Key words placed alphabetically</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>There is no need to include under a separate title of RECOMMENDATION of further work rather encompassed in the last paragraph of discussion section.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The overall introduction of manuscript needs to be revised according to objective of the work.</p> <p>✓ Background of introduction should be pivoted around toxicity and bioavailability of such heavy metals that found in the waste burnt tire residues at global and the country where investigation was being carried out.</p> <p>**Author must need to incorporate the (references of) factors of elevated heavy metals chromium/cobalt, bismuth, rubidium, gold, tungsten, iron, thorium, copper, niobium and arsenic exposure that pose or/ and exhibit a significant negative impact on aquatic as well as human life. However, Author had cited the very few research papers that showed the</p>	

Review Form 3

	frequency of metal pollution in fish particularly in areas where used tires are burned or disposed of as fuel.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Introduction of manuscript seem to be very short and need to be updated with latest references. This section didn't have enough content to reflect the importance of the current work. All references should be in proper format as long as by journal guidelines (Year of publication in journal should be in similar pattern) Following references are required to be revised- Ref- 10, Refs 24-29	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?	*This manuscript is written in underprivileged script all over the text; I recommend to revise it with help of English scholars with line wise. "English language and scientific nomenclatures should be in italics; some need to be amended in the manuscript."	
Optional/General comments	Conclusion didn't reflect the importance of the research. Authors need to mention the unusual findings of the work	

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:	Randhir Kumar
Department, University & Country	Veer Kunwar Singh University, India