SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_51883**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Validation Of Efficiency Method For Heavy Metals Determination In Kola Nuts (Cola nitida Schott & Endl.) From Côte d'Ivoire**
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	**Quite a good Research here! But the following clarifications are needed.** **1. Your Topic or Title says Validation of Efficiency Method but the content is as if you are developing a new method. If you are validating only, who develop the method? State the developer or include Development in the title.** **2. In your method of digestion of sample for Heavy metals analysis using AAS, only Nitric acid was used in addition to Hydrogen peroxide. Do you think this method can give better results than the conventional AOAC methods where at least 2 strong acids are used sometimes in addition to Hydrogen peroxide?** **3. If you are developing a new method here, Don't you think it would have been better to analyse the samples using one of the conventional methods that is already in place alongside this one and then compare the results?** **4. What is the role of Tin (II) chloride in your Sample digestion procedure?. Is it used when analysing for Mercury only in the sample?** **5. Please refer to the manuscript for other word corrections highlighted for clarity.**	1. The references of the method were added in the manuscript 2. There are no better results. There are just the results we get with the method set up. The results Obtained in this study reflect the reliability of the only acid used. the combination of acids just serves to increase their oxidative power during mineralization 3. It's not a new method he references of the method were added in the manuscript 4. Lead and cadmium analysis was done in flame with wavelengths of 217 nm and 228.8 nm, respectively. Mercury analysis was performed in hydride mode. The cold vapors are produced from a hydride generator (VGA 77) in the presence of a solution of 10% tin-II chloride previously prepared with 37% fuming hydrochloric acid. 5. The corrections have been made in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	References should be formatted according to the Journal's guidelines.	The corrections have been made in the manuscript
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	