

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_76431
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-availability and Bio-accessibility of Lead and Zinc in Contaminated Soil from Cwymystwyth Lead Mine Site
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is a very interesting manuscript. Through investigation, we can understand the impact of mines on human health. However, a clear distinction, a clear manuscript requires clear content and data, the source of the data and the basis of moral theory are very important things. Therefore, I will make the following suggestions for the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I need to confirm with the author here. Regarding the stomach and intestines mentioned in the article, what biological body do they come from? 2. Secondly, among all the data, what is the sampled data? 3. If it is a human being, this is already an experimental study of invasive sampling. Is it possible to propose a moral and ethical mechanism that proves to be in line with the research science? 4. If it is not a human being, what are the organisms sampled? How many? How long does it live locally? 5. What is the relationship between the amount of heavy metals in the surface, middle, and bottom layers of the soil and organisms? 6. Are the food sources of the test organisms grown in these places? Or are there any factors that can prove the relationship between soil heavy metals and organisms? 7. Do you consider it, just state the metal content of the soil directly, and delete the biological part!? 8. It seems difficult to understand the relevance between the content of the conclusion and the topic. Please think about the content of the conclusion based on the topic. <p>Finally, this is a very meaningful topic. It is a pity that the content of the article, research process, subjects, analysis results, and the subject seem to have no intention of understanding.</p> <p>9. I also found an interesting thing. This article is a comment, but there is research. So, is this a survey study? Or a comment? This is confusing.</p> <p>It is recommended that the author re-plan and think about the goals of the manuscript in addition to supplementing the relevant information. I believe there will be a clearer logic and contribution to society.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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> There are ethical issues with this manuscript. The manuscript did not explain the subject, source, willingness and other information.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hsiao-Hsien Lin</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Jiaying University, China</i>

Review Form 1.6

Created by: EA

Checked by: ME

Approved by: CEO

Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)