



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1716
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the Distribution of Heavy Metals in Different Tissues of Fishes from River Benue in Vinikilang, Adamawa State, Nigeria.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The manuscript is well designed, discussed and concluded. The results are very beneficial for the researchers.	Ok with comment
Specific comments:	The abstract is too long.	Not agree, because the abstract touches all aspect of the work. And it is divided into different headings
Title and abstract	The title is suitable but abstract is too long and must be shortened.	Ok for title but Not agree for abstract, because the abstract touches all aspect of the work. And it is divided into different headings
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	This section is well defined related to the manuscript.	Ok with comment
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The references cited are relevant and adequate. There aren't any other suitable current references authors need to cite according to my best knowledge up to date.	Ok with comment
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	There is no problem with the sample collection method. There also is no problem with Digestion of Fish Samples for Heavy Metal Determination. The calibration solution is relevant for this analysis. Therefore, the applied material and methods is suitable and there is no any problem with this situation.	Ok with comment
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	The data given in the result section is well controlled and robust. Discussion is given for each metal individually and supported with the other studies. Each individual discussion is supported by the references. Discussion and conclusion are based on the actual facts and all of them were supported by figures. The figures are very clear. The statistical analysis is sufficient.	Ok with comment
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No there aren't.	Ok with comment
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	The conclusion is supported by the data.	Ok with comment
References	Sufficient.	Ok with comment