



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_37996
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Determination of Heavy Metal Concentrations in Herbal Teas Marketed in Various Countries including Libya
Type of the 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction should be rearranged. Finish each issue at the same place. If do so, it will be clear and concise. In 2.1 Sample collection, you mentioned "... which are normally consumed in Misurata city in Libya" but readers may need to know if these tea were planted in Libya or if any of them were imported. You used Pearson correlation for statistical analysis. I think you should use paired t-test for this analysis. If it is not the format of this journal, you should separate the result section from the part of discussion. Let readers see the results and interpret by themselves. <p>I think figures 1 to 8 are not necessary. They were the repeated data from table 3. You may remove table 3 and keep figures 1 to 8 by adding SD. values on the chart bars.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Veeravan Lekskulchai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand</i>