

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_88985
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITATIVE TEST OF HEAVY METALS IN <i>Chanos chanos</i>
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://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The title is incomplete. There is no mention of the type of animal or its common name.2. The Abstract has some gross errors which need to be corrected.3. The Methodology has not been presented properly. The sub-heads should have been elaborated more properly. The References cited should have been placed in the proper places instead of giving them at the end. The spellings of some words have been spelt according to the American format which should be corrected to the English format. There is no mention of any Statistical Analysis being performed to show the significance of data. It is also observed, that no water quality analysis of the fish pond in which <i>Chanos chanos</i> was cultured has been presented.4. The Results and Discussion has been very poorly presented. Even though, Tables have been given to reveal the results of the analysis of the heavy metals detected but, as regards Discussion of the findings there is nothing presented.5. The Conclusion needs modification.6. The References have not been presented according to the format of the Journal.	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	The Manuscript seems to be incomplete. There are many aspects not covered. The deficiencies need to be fulfilled. The Manuscript as such needs to be revised very thoroughly for acceptance.	

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:	Sudip Barat
Department, University & Country	University of North Bengal, India