



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_59030
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metal Analysis of Three Urban Rivers in Enugu, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<p>The authors present an important result, although the manuscript needs a thorough revision and an extensive rewrite for increasing its clarity and readability.</p> <p>Comments to Authors: Major comments</p> <p>1. Title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The title is still too broad, it's like doing a review from a journal. If it can be specified for the title. Studies conducted are limited to water samples, while river flows do not only have water, but there is land, surrounding plants and biota. So you can focus more on water samples. <p>2. Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please correct again <p>3. Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In this chapter still a lot of sentences that the degree of similarity with the literature. In the introductory chapter still a lot of sentences that the degree of similarity with the literature. (see the results of turnitin checks) - The objectives of this study should be extended with the interest of this study in risk assessment of heavy metal. <p>4. Material and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fig 1. Please be replaced by a clearer picture related to the location of the river. Marked the point of sampling. - For each method, please quote from what source <p>5. Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the results section presented, tables 1-3 should be supplemented with quality standards for applicable aquatic environments - For Fig 2. please correct it again because the error bar is still wrong. there is no difference between the bar lines, all the same length - When the results of other experiments are used in discussion, it is necessary to give some information like duration of sampling <p>6. Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion is weak and not convincing. The authors should make a clear synthesis of the obtained results. <p>7. References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the inclusion of references, please use Mendeley or other applications, so that it is easier to be checked 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	In conclusion, the authors performed an original research work. I consider that the work needs a major revision, and then when this is complied, the manuscript is acceptable for publication.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Awaludin Adam
Department, University & Country	University of Ibrahimy, Indonesia