



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_13913
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON EFFECTS OF HEAVY METAL TOXICITY ON HEALTH OF AUTISTIC POPULATION
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper addresses a very interesting and current topic, which is the possible influence of heavy metals on autistic children. However, in my opinion, this review paper has substantial limitations. In general terms, the authors do not explain the methods they have used in performing this review, for example the search criteria such as the data bases and articles they have used, the keywords, the years, etc. In more specific terms, the introduction does not provide a good justification for the review. The authors seem to have pulled together a series of out-of-context statements from different articles (some of which are not very relevant or are very small studies), which may lead the reader to misinterpretations. The authors themselves come to a rather firm conclusion that, in my opinion, is not justifiable based only on this review. The references are set out inconsistently and follow no recommended guidelines, e.g: • Some references have the year of publication at the end and some others before the page numbers. • Sometimes the journal's name is complete and other times are abbreviated. • Author's names are sometimes complete, sometimes with first initials, either before or after the last name. • Sometimes all the authors are listed (up to 13), sometimes one author is listed with an	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“et al” and yet another time six authors are listed with an “et al.”.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• In the abstract, line 7, zinc is mentioned twice; perhaps it should be arsenic. • The authors discuss a number of studies without including a reference, for example in the section “heavy metals and the correlation with autism”. • The authors cite a number of studies on heavy metals in hair and nails, but do not describe the limitations of such analyses (except for mercury and arsenic). • Reviews sometimes do not take into account the differences between different species of the metal in question and the biological specimen in which it is analyzed. For example, methylmercury is mainly in blood, hair and nails, while inorganic mercury is in urine. Also, organic arsenic is found in blood while inorganic arsenic is mainly in urine. This is important because the toxicity of each one is different.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper needs a thorough English review.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Spain