



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The abstract doesn't bring out the background and study gap as well as the recommendation. • The introduction covers a good literature review on sources and effects of heavy metals. However, it's not clear why the interest is hence inclined to Damerra community? What triggers the study towards this dimension? There is no study gap! • Line 76-78 do not conform to the title. Is this a correlation study? • Sampling isn't reproducible. Eg was the milk expressed from the same region as the water? Were all mothers having the same age of infants? Was drinking water obtained from all sources of water stated in line 43? • State the replicates made in the methodology (n=?) • There are different font types in the manuscript see in the section of results and discussion • Line 121: where we refer to high, there's need to have the standard we are referring to? • Line 133 backs the findings but this wasn't stated in the introduction? • New citations cropped up in the discussion. This isn't right if not introduced • There is no discussion in this article, basically it's another literature review. • The referencing style needs to be rechecked. • Which statistical tool was used to analyse data? There are neither p-values nor correlation parameters?	It has been added It has been corrected It has been corrected Drinking tap water, It has been corrected When I sent the paper, font types is changed It has been corrected It has been corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Ethical issue: to obtain human samples in this case breast milk the ethical considerations should be stated	It has been added
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 3: remove the fullstop - Line 76, the use of the word confirm is destructive since the presiding paragraphs do not show this? - Line 81 Start with capital B - Methods should be reported in the correct tense and check the grammar in this section, it's wanting - Line 101 see correct for subscript in the formula of Nitric acid - Line 119 & 124 : the two values for aren't equal so the use of the word highest is inappropriate to refer to both - Line 176 which are the international permissible limits being referred to? - There is no reference to table 3 in text, this should be inserted. - The FIGURES REPLICATE THE TABLES? Why so?	It has been corrected It has been corrected (WHO, 1993, 2003)
Optional/General comments	The introduction has long paragraph. There reference 1980 is rather old. Line 175: delete the words in conclusion	It has been corrected Thank you