



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_30517
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of heavy metals in breast milk and drinking water in Damietta Governorate, Egypt.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This research evaluate and confirm a correlation between the levels of different heavy metals in breast milk and drinking water in Damietta Governorate community. However, the number of samples (11) is very low to draw a conclusion that the concentrations of Cd and Pb in the breast milk and drinking water samples collected from Damietta Governorate were higher than international permissible limits. I would ask the author(s) to consider the following: 1- Please refine the purpose of this study more clearly in the introduction. 2- It is not well organized; also, methods and discussion are not clearly shown for readers. The issue relates to the structure of the text. Sometimes it remains unclear why something is written at a particular section in the text. Generally, I suggest editing the text. 3- The manuscript is hard to read (style wise)	It has been corrected When i send it the coordination is changed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please delete of from the first sentence in abstract The abstract need to be revised. There are some English mistakes in the introduction; I believe the author will be able to figure out as they revise the manuscript. There are some long sentences.	It has been corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the whole manuscript should be revised for English errors (there are many subject-predicate errors). Taking into account the completed score sheet and the comments above, after careful examination, the paper requires deep revision.	Thank you
---	--	-----------