

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_76774
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Heavy Metals in Breast Milk of Breast feeding Mothers in Urban and Sub-urban Subjects in Rivers State
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>In general the topic is of utmost importance and the methodology is fine. The research is not a novel research because similar works are already done but it may contribute to science by providing information about the specific place under consideration. To this end I recommend the following revisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results of the heavy metal analysis for the 59 samples should be displayed systematically in the paper, because the presented results are not informative. 2. The heavy metal composition in breast milk of postpartum women from urban and sub-urban settlements varies (eg. Pb and Cd) but the difference is not statistically significant. Please clearly state this fact. Moreover, do not mention about the nutrients in the abstract and conclusion because you haven't studied nutrients. You have investigated only heavy metals. 3. Please clearly specify the scope and objectives of the research in the introduction part. 4. The authors are strongly recommended to use relevant and up-to-date references. Of the 11 references used only reference 7 discusses about heavy metal analysis in breast milk, although there are plenty of papers related to the same topic in literature. 5. There exists long paragraphs without citations in the introduction and the discussion part and have to be properly cited. 6. Information about quality control is needed. Number of replicates, standard reference materials and information about the calibration of the instrument are also needed. 7. The discussion part is weak and the results are not thoroughly discussed by comparison with literature. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Lifestyle for example diet and tobacco smoking and other factors such as body weight have some effects on the level of heavy metals in breast milk. Authors are recommended to discuss about these things in the discussion part using some literature. At least they can mention about the feeding habits of the nursing women and the nutritional or heavy metal content of those feeds in the studied area.</p>	

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:	Goitom Kfle Gebremariam
Department, University & Country	Eritrea Institute of Technology, Eritrea