

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript provides critical insights into the health risks associated with heavy metal contamination in seafood, specifically crabs from different environmental contexts in Nigeria. By comparing metal concentrations in crabs from oil-producing and non-oil-producing communities, it highlights the impact of industrial activities on food safety and public health. The use of rigorous analytical methods and health risk assessments contributes to the growing body of literature on environmental toxicology and food safety, offering valuable data for policymakers and researchers. Furthermore, the findings underscore the need for continuous monitoring and regulation of heavy metal levels in aquatic ecosystems to protect human health and ensure sustainable seafood consumption.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not provided, but based on the content discussed, a suitable title could be: "Assessment of Heavy Metal Contamination and Health Risks in Crabs (Scylla senrata) from Oil and Non-Oil Producing Communities in Rivers State, Nigeria." This title clearly reflects the study's focus on heavy metal levels and their implications for health in specific geographic contexts.	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.	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings; however, it could be enhanced by including a few additional points.</p> <p>1. Contextual Background: Briefly mention the significance of heavy metal contamination in aquatic environments and its relevance to public health.</p> <p>2. Specific Findings: Include a summary of the most concerning heavy metals and their concentrations to highlight the severity of contamination.</p> <p>3. Recommendations: Suggest the need for further research or monitoring efforts to address long-term health implications.</p> <p>Incorporating these elements would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the study's importance and implications for the scientific community and public health.</p>	<p>Revision made</p> <p>Noted</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the provided information, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It employs appropriate analytical methods, such as flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry, for measuring heavy metal concentrations in crab samples. The use of the Target Hazard Quotient (THQ) for health risk assessment is a recognized approach in environmental toxicology, and the results indicate that the THQ values are below 1, suggesting minimal non-carcinogenic health risks. Additionally, the manuscript emphasizes the importance of ongoing monitoring, which is a sound recommendation given the potential long-term ecological and health implications of heavy metal contamination.	Corrected
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references cited in the manuscript include a mix of foundational studies and recent research, which provides a solid background for the topic. However, some references date back to 2003, and the manuscript could benefit from more recent studies to ensure the information is up-to-date.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p>	Revision made accordingly

Review Form 3

	<div>1. Recent studies on heavy metal contamination in aquatic ecosystems, particularly in developing countries.</div> <div>2. Current guidelines or reviews from organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) or the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding heavy metal exposure and health risks.</div> <div>3. Research articles focusing on the bioaccumulation of heavy metals in seafood and their implications for human health published within the last five years.</div> <div>Incorporating these additional references would enhance the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness.</div>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication based on the provided excerpts. The manuscript uses appropriate scientific terminology and presents information clearly and concisely. However, a thorough proofreading for grammatical accuracy, clarity, and coherence is recommended to ensure that the writing meets the highest academic standards. Additionally, checking for consistency in terminology and formatting throughout the manuscript would further enhance its quality.	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. Clarity of Data Presentation: Consider using tables or figures to present heavy metal concentration data and THQ values more clearly, as visual aids can enhance understanding and comparison.</div> <div>2. Discussion of Implications: Expand the discussion section to include potential ecological impacts and recommendations for local communities regarding seafood consumption, as this would provide practical relevance to the findings.</div> <div>3. Future Research Directions: Suggest specific areas for future research, such as long-term monitoring of heavy metal levels or studies on the effects of these contaminants on local wildlife and human health, to guide subsequent investigations.</div> <div>These comments aim to improve the manuscript's overall impact and relevance in the field of environmental science and public health.</div> <div>Based on the provided information and considering the clarity of the research, the relevance of the topic, and the overall quality of the writing, I would assign an overall mark of 7 to this manuscript.</div> <div>This indicates a Major Revision is needed, as while the study presents valuable findings, improvements in data presentation, language quality, and a more comprehensive discussion of implications are necessary for it to meet the standards for publication.</div>	<div>Corrected as suggested</div> <div>Done</div>

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