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Reviewer's report:

The paper is well written and of interest for the audience of the journal. However some revisions need to be carried on before to consider the paper completely acceptable.

1- In 2.2 Sample Collection subsection, the periods of collection of the samples and the number of the samples collected must be explained.

2- Is there a local ethics committee report on experimental animals in this study? It must be given in 2.2 Sample Collection subsection.

3- Digestion method of muscle, liver, and gill of Asian swamp eel for heavy metal analysis must be explained in the Materials and Methods section.

4- The Discussion section on the article should be improved using some articles. For example:

Çulha, S. T., Yabanlı, M., Baki, B., & Yozukmaz, A. (2016). Heavy metals in tissues of scorpionfish (Scorpaena porcus) caught from Black Sea (Turkey) and potential risks to human health. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(20), 20882-20892.


The content of the article in accordance with the aims of BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology
The data presented in the study are new. This article contains new aspects.
The article is scientifically sufficient.
The literature sufficiently critical, current, and internationally is evaluated
The language of the article is correct and clear.
Acceptable after minor revisions.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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