



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_35900
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAVY METAL LEVELS IN BEANS (Vignaunguiculata) IN SELECTED MARKETS IN IBADAN, NIGERIA
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>)



[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	Dealing with trace metals in relation with food safety is still actual and do need enough experiences and results to build a real data to be explored. As a paper contribution, the author has carried out and realized interesting experiences and obtained significant results. Meanwhile, i do presume that this kind of subject needs more time and experiences for a more durable conclusions and results. Besides minor English mistakes and phrases formulation (line 47, 62.63,68, 69.....). Line 47: It has been estimated Line 62: Reformulate the phrase Line 68: Which may be used -Paper as it is presented is consistent from the scientific point of view. Meanwhile it could have been more consistent if the author has added some brief theoretical presentation of trace metals (Cd, Pb and Hg) and also some information about Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy (AAS), technique most used for the determination of trace metals. -Discussion of results needs to be detailed. -In some results, the standard deviation appears to be greater than the results itself. It could be due to standard solutions preparation easy to correct, but still acceptable and honest. -Regarding the results obtained, i presume that the conclusion can be detailed and developed.	These had been corrected. This had been attended to. I have attended to this as well.
Minor REVISION comments	Some lines to be reformulated and correction of some English mistakes.	Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The need to respect the abstract writing form. Too much titles.	