

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_122361
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Major Interfering Substances for Heavy Metal Determination in Northern Sea Areas of Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This article is important to address the necessity of frequent monitoring of the selected locations in Sri Lanka. Also highlighting the anthropogenic effects that contaminate the recreational areas, with several parameters. This article outputs the different responses of the aquatic environment according to the different settelement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A title without "Major Interfering Substances" would be better. A more suitable article would be "Heavy Metal Determination in Northern Sea Areas of Sri Lanka".	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and the structure of the manuscript is appropriate.	
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.	The results section explained in detail in the term of the relation of the findings and the interpretation. However the methods section is lacking of clarity and detail. The reason of the methods selected could be explained in detail. I suggest the writers add the importance of the methods selected to the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest the methods section should be more comprehensive and the reasons of the methods used in this research should be explained in detail. Also the map should be clearer and /or a better map should be used instead of the current one.	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Figen Esin Kayhan
Department, University & Country	Marmara University, Turkey