



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_26972
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF EDIBLE CLAY FROM ENYIGBA IN EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA, FOR ESSENTIAL NUTRIENT METALLIC ELEMENTS AND ANALYSIS OF TISSUES AND ORGANS OF RABBITS FOR THE CLAY CONSTITUENTS, FOLLOWING ORAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE CLAY
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	ABSTRACT AND INTRODUCTION The sentence "Clay is a naturally occurring aluminium silicate" is not appropriate. You need to improve the definition. In general, clay mineral is phyllosilicate. But, not aluminum phyllosilicate. For example: Talc $[MgsSi_4O_{10}(OH)_2]$ is a Clay mineral, but not contain aluminum. In addition, many clay minerals may be oxi-hidroxi-des, whitout phyllosilicate. MATERIAL AND METHODS Material and methods need more information. SAMPLE AREA AND SAMPLE COLLECTION How many points were collected? PREPARATION OF CLAY SAMPLE FOR ANALYSIS As the samples of clay were ground? Change "cm³" units for "ml", why it is liquid, ml is more appropriate. Aqua regia (informing the reactants and proportion of each). EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS Rabbits: Adult age is the stage. But how many days? What race of rabbits? How many rabbits of each sex? What is the initial weight of the rabbits? What are the environmental conditions in the	NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	acclimatization period? The food in the acclimation period. Which vegetables and grass? STATISTICAL ANALYSIS Make it clear which were the treatments? which is compared by ANOVA? <u>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</u> Change "results and discursions" to "results and discussion". ACUTE TOXICITY STUDY "did not produce any mortality in the treated rabbits using the up and down method.". This sentence was already written in the material and methods. The results could be expanded. CONCENTRATIONS OF METALS IN EDIBLE TISSUES AND BLOOD "The concentrations obtained with the 4000mg/kg dose in various tissues and blood were significantly (P less than 0.05) higher than those obtained with the 2000mg/kg dose (Table 2)." But in Table 2 the statistics is between the tissues, not between doses. It is the difference between repeated doses in the text. But not in the Tables. If there was a difference, it should appear in the tables as well. Tables should be self-explanatory. ELIMINATION RATE CONSTANT AND HALF LIVES OF ESSENTIAL METALLIC NUTRIENT ELEMENTS FROM EDIBLE CLAY IN VARIOUS TISSUES In any of the figures was added to the difference obtained by statistical analysis, only the text that is	NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	commented. It should be added to the statistical figures, as the figures should be self-explanatory.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Key words Edible clay and Rabbits are in the title. Exchange for others that are not in the title. Units Many units appear with the numbers. To separate. (example: 249.000mg/g. Correct: 249.000 mg/g). Check “ml” units. Use only “ml”, not “mls”. Check the citations in the text because some are not in the reference list.	NOTED AND EFFECTED
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Material and methods need more information. See compulsory revision comments. Results and discussion 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? Yes. However, in the material and methods it says that a control group was analyzed (without ingestion of clay). Why this group does not appear in the results and statistical comparison? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. The 34 references are only 3 of the last ten years. Is not current! But are relevant. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. Yes. However, the discussion is general. You need to add some explanations of the differences about Ca, Mg, Na and K. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out? In general, the analyses are appropriate. But should be	NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED NOTED AND EFFECTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	better described in materials and methods, and results of statistical analyses should be added in the figures. In addition, you should review the control group; it was not addressed in the discussion or statistical analyses results. Conclusion OK.	
--	--	--