



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRB_37996</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Quantitative Determination of Heavy Metal Concentrations in Herbal Teas Marketed in Various Countries including Libya</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction should be rearranged. Finish each issue at the same place. If do so, it will be clear and concise.</li> <li>2. In 2.1 Sample collection, you mentioned "... which are normally consumed in Misurata city in Libya" but readers may need to know if these tea were planted in Libya or if any of them were imported.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4. You used Pearson correlation for statistical analysis. I think you should use paired t-test for this analysis.</li> <li>5. If it is not the format of this journal, you should separate the result section from the part of discussion. Let readers see the results and interpret by themselves.</li> <li>6. I think figures 1 to 8 are not necessary. They were the repeated data from table 3. You may remove table 3 and keep figures 1 to 8 by adding SD. values on the chart bars.</li> </ol>	<p>1- <b>The introduction very clear and concise. so, I think we do not need to rearranged.</b></p> <p>3- The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is a measure of correlation strength. But, the t-test is used to determine whether the correlation coefficient is significant. So, I am sure we have to use Pearson correlation coefficient (r) for that analysis.</p> <p>4- Most of journals use results and discussion in the same part and it is very clear for reader. We do not need to separate the results section from the discussion pane. It will be annoying to the reader</p> <p>5- The figures will be more clear for reader, If we adding SD. values on the chart bars it will be annoying to the reader (small space).</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		