



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_43748
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Assesment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons In Water Sample From Dadin Kowa Dam, Gombe State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review Paper

Comment [M1]: The way this article presented is a research article contrary to what is written in here and in the main 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	1. This article is written REVIEW ARTICLE but its content and mode of reporting is actually a RESEARCH ARTICLE. This is to be resolved before any further consideration. 2. This article is too much long, 18 pages need to be revised to at least 10-12 pages so that readers will not get tired to read it. Ethical issue: YES, there is ethical issue in this article. This article is submitted as review article but the content is research article, for example, Table 1-6 in the main article do not show what was/were the source of data and therefore these data stand as original research data. Also the abstract, discussion and conclusion sections do not show evidence of review article.	
Minor REVISION comments	Seem some comments in the main article	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miraji Hossein
Department, University & Country	University of Dodoma, Tanzania