

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_129924
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Risk Assessment of Heavy Metals and Hydrocarbon Contamination in selected Seafood from Coastal Regions of Southern Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript highlights health hazards associated with the consumption of selected seafood from coastal areas prone to pollutants such as heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in southern Nigeria by comparing observed values with regulatory standards. It is beneficial to scientific community because it addresses gaps of understanding carcinogenic risk and target hazard quotient of heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the southern Nigeria. Findings reveal the carcinogenic risk associated with consumption of seafood and importance of controlling environmental pollutants from Bakana River.	--
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title gives clear indication of study's focus. However, it can be readjusted to make it more engaging. Here is possible replacement: "Assessment of Health hazards of heavy metals and hydrocarbon contamination in selected seafood from coastal regions of southern Nigeria."	Correction effected alongside article title suggested by other reviewers.  New Title: "Human Health Risk Assessment of Heavy Metals and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Seafood from Southern Nigeria's Coastal Regions."
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides logical presentation of information such as aim of study, study design, methodology and results. However, can be improved upon. Below are some proposed considerations for improvement: Additions: Aim: clearly state the aims and its significance to scientific community. Study design should include specific terms. Methodology should state methods used to identify pollutants. Results should present the values of each contaminants recorded during the study as well as WHO limits. Conclusion should summarise the major implications of the findings to the public and environment.  Deletions: Place and duration of study as indicated may not be necessary. Components of food may not be necessary.	Corrections effected.  Revised abstract is presented.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, however, the author should ensure consistency in citations.	Noted
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	--

**Review Form 3**

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	--
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-Readjust the title to make it engaging. -review the abstract to capture only essentials. -ensure consistency in citations.	Corrections effected

**PART 2:**

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