



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_43693
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Data Analysis: Heavy Metals from Drinking Water to Human Body
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>)

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>1. Values of trace metals in this study should be compared with those of WHO for example to show if the trace metals present in this manuscript are within the normal ranges or not.</p> <p>2. It would be better to make a comparison between the different types of drinking water and their effect on hair, finger nails and toe nails in a Table.</p> <p>3. Correlation values in Table (1) are very small meaning weak significance between the different parameters.</p>	<p>1. The trace metals levels obtained in this research work was compared with the results of the previous studies. No WHO recommended values.</p> <p>2. This is out of the scope of the objectives of this study. The data is so complex.</p> <p>3. Yes, that is natural and we have to consider them as they are.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Line 105: The map should have a pointer to the North direction, the Longitude and the Latitude should be present on the map.</p> <p>2. Line 108: All the 129 samples were of different types of water. There is no mention in the manuscript to the number of hair, finger nails and toe nails samples.</p> <p>3. Line 113-116: The effect of smoking chronic diseases..... were not declared although they are mentioned in the manuscript to show their effect either increasing or decreasing the trace metals concentrations.</p> <p>4. Line 396: copper did not show not shows.</p>	<p>1. The map has been updated and has a pointer to the North direction.</p> <p>2. No. See line 109: This study consists of one hundred and twenty nine samples (n=129) of water, hair, toe nail and fingernail.....</p> <p>3. Line 113-116 described the nature of subjects covered in the study.</p> <p>4. Line 396 described the correlation analyses for Fe and Cu which did not show any significant matched relationship.</p>
Optional/General comments	The paper is good but it needs some corrections	A good and marvelous remark. Some corrections have been rectified where necessary.

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)	