

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_129745
Title of the Manuscript:	Health Risk Evaluation of Heavy Metals in Crab (Scylla senrata) from Oil and Non-Oil Producing Communities in Akuku-Toru Local Government Area, Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Risk assessment is an emerging area in toxicology that actually reveals the potential risk associated with environmental pollutants and this study is one of such that is practicable. This study is evaluating the gap between oil producing and non -oil producing communities. The results are very clear and informative for decision makers and policy regulations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is more than 18 words and it can be modified as follows; Health Risk Evaluation of Heavy Metals in Crab (Scylla senrata) from selected Communities in Akuku-Toru Local Government Area, Rivers State, Nigeria	Title revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The statistical tool used in analysis of data and the confidence level used in the analysis should be stated. The year of recommended FEPA limit should be stated.	Noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, while comparing across stations oil producing and non-oil producing communities, the differences in mean concentrations across the various stations should be stated. Turkey HSDor Ducan can reveal the mean separation across the stations. Also, the p>0.005 or 0.001 should be stated.	ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References poorly rewritten. Editors should recommend a standard in manuscript guide to guide author.	ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language was good for scholarly communication. Subject verb agreement was maintained at all times.	ok
Optional/General comments	Good research work, corrections should be made by author and editors can review for publication.	Thanks

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	