

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_70211
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum hepato-renal parameters of Nigerian solid waste scavengers- a pilot study Short title: Effect of solid waste on liver & kidney
Type of the Article	Original 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Title not reflecting the objective of the studyThe structural abstract :the introduction part shouldn't contain the method(29 solid waste scavengers ...)move it to methods and sentences should not start with numbers .moreover discussion is not a part of abstractThe abstract conclusion is not related to the manuscript conclusion Abstract needs to be revised accordinglyIn the data collection of the materials and methods details about the questionnaire duration in both manuscript and abstract needed to be mentioned ,validation of the questionnaire rather than this pilotingAge group included?Intravenous drug administration ,alcohol consumption and smoking are possible causes of impaired liver and renal function and these groups should be excluded from the study .the author can mention this in the discussion and It is recommended to put this confounders as exclusion criteriaThe manuscript conclusion should be informative reflecting the gap of knowledge ,conclusion of the results even if it was negative with possible implications and recommendations for the further research studyReferences are not updated Only 8 out of 28 are not older than 5 yearsSome references are incompletely cited 3-4	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amal Ahmed Ismail
Department, University & Country	Qassim University, Saudi Arabia