



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_42572
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Milling Equipment on the Level of Heavy Metal Content of Foodstuff
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In some cases, the values of control were found to be higher than those of B.M. and H.M. (Table 1). The values obtained for the control seem to be troubled. It must be re-glanced.</p> <p>A conclusion describing the advantages of the work done and the contribution to the literature should be written.</p> <p>Standard deviations should be added.</p> <p>The discussion is poor. The discussion part of the manuscript should be improved.</p>	<p>We have double check the table and modified whether required</p> <p>Conclusion part has been revised according to the comments</p> <p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript by incorporating the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.</p>
Optional/General comments		