



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_12580
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of the Bioavailability and Impact of Habits on the Occupational Exposure of Electronic Repairers to Lead (Pb), Cadmium (Cd) and Chromium (Cr) in Kaduna Metropolis-Nigeria
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>)



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	I believe it would be worthwhile to mention limitations of the study. For example, it should be mentioned that the bulk of the heavy metal burden in the body is not reflected in a serum test. Most of the metals sequester into tissues – e.g. Pb in bone – and there may be very little in serum. Serum levels generally reflect recent exposure. So in these workers, they may be marked variation in total body burden, which is not reflected at all in the serum test.	It is very correct that blood metal concentration does not give the total body metal burden. This was partly why the research analysed also the subjects' urine samples, as urine metal concentration gives an indication of the total body burden since urine is one of the main points of excretion of most of the metals. However, a statement of this would be included into the write up. Thanks.
Minor REVISION comments	I think it would be beneficial to propose some solutions for the workers. For example a brief comment that adequate ventilation with the rapid removal of air containing metals may go a long way to diminish exposure.	Some suggestions were given in the manuscript but were removed for concern of the volume of the paper. Some of the vital suggestions would be reintegrated back into the write up. Thanks.
Optional/General comments	I enjoyed this paper and believe it is a worthwhile addition to the scientific literature. I am a clinician and thus am not able to comments on the statistics or the chemistry in the paper. You will need other reviewers for these aspects.	Thanks