

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_113303
Title of the Manuscript:	HEALTH RISKS ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METAL CONCENTRATION IN CULTURED <i>Chanos chanos</i> (BANGUS) AND <i>Scylla serrata</i> (MUDCRAB) IN SELECTED MUNICIPALITIES IN NORTHERN SAMAR
Type of the Article	

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) The manuscript on health risks from heavy metal contamination in cultured Bangus and Mudcrab in Northern Samar is crucial for the scientific community. It offers valuable insights into food safety and public health by assessing heavy metal levels in seafood products. The study's use of a robust framework and statistical analyses enhances its scientific significance, making it a vital contribution to environmental health and food safety research.</p> <p>2) Yes, the title is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the study on assessing health risks associated with heavy metal contamination in cultured Bangus and Mudcrab in specific areas of Northern Samar.</p> <p>3) Yes, the abstract concisely presents the essential information, making it a comprehensive summary of the research conducted in the manuscript.</p> <p>4) Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate based on the information provided in the excerpts.</p> <p>5) Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The use of statistical analyses such as Spearman correlations and Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) demonstrates a rigorous approach to data analysis. Additionally, the incorporation of a conceptual framework (DPSIR) to assess the impact of heavy metal concentrations on the environment and society reflects a scientifically valid methodology for addressing environmental health issues.</p> <p>6) It may be beneficial to consider recent publications related to heavy metal contamination in aquatic organisms, health risks assessment methodologies, environmental management strategies, and relevant regulatory frameworks. These additional references could further strengthen the scientific foundation of the study and provide a more comprehensive literature review.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1) Based on the provided excerpts, the language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The text is well-structured, and the language used is clear and concise, which is essential for effective scholarly communication. The Grammarly report showed a score of 75%. I hope the score is acceptable to the journal.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Aditya Mktan Tamang
Department, University & Country	Sikkim Alpine University, India