OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.78956
Published in: Health Scope: 8(2) ; e78956

Peer Review Report for "Health Risk Assessment of Some Heavy Metals from Canned Tuna and Fish in Tijuana, Mexico"

Author(s): Diana Dolores Rodriguez-Mendivil, Enrique Garcia-Flores, Juan Temores-Pena, Fernando Toyohiko Wakida

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 May 2018
Revised Date:	10 Jan 2019
Accepted Date:	14 Feb 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hossein Kamani : Reviewer

6 Jul 2018

Dear Editor, my comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Keywords are not suitable, revise them (Select them from Mesh).
- There are language problems and writing problems in this manuscript. Manuscript needs to be revised.
- Correct the ingestion rate of fish. “11.4 kg per capita” is false. It seems to be 11.4 kg/capita. year.
- Please describe all of the abbreviations for the first time in the abstract. What does GBC stand for?
- Integrate all parts of the material and methods into one part.

- What does this sentence mean: “Calibration blanks and method blanks were below the method detection limit”?
- Add the maximum permissible limit (MPL) of the Mexican standard, European Union (EU) standard, in tables 3 and 4.
- Revise the “Cf is the conversion factor of 103 kg/g”.
- Describe all parameters of each equation after that equation.
- Write all RfD of heavy metals in the manuscript and in a table.
- You wrote the EF is 365. Do people consume fish and tuna every day? EF is adjusted according to people's habits and the number of days they consume fish. EF refers to the days that people are exposed to the contaminant(here, EF is fish and tuna)
- Why did you write “the total annual fish consumption of 1.23 kg/year per capita” in the section of the formula?
- Why did you write the IR=3.4 g/day while you mentioned fish consumption is 11.4 kg/capita?
- This statement is not true” ….or consumption dose of fish….” in the Characterization of health risk section.
- “C is wet weight in mg/kg” is not true. C is the concentration of contaminant in fish or tuna.
- “Cf is the conversion factor.” It seems to be 1000.
- Change “target hazard quotient (THQ)” into “hazard quotient (HQ)” in the manuscript.
- Change Cf, Ef, and Rf into the CF, EF, and RF, respectively.
- Sum all HQ of metals and make a THQ parameter (total hazard quotient) for all metals, and add that to the table. (refer to a few health risk articles).
- Characterization of health risk doesn’t have a good discussion. Improve that and compare data, and describe the risk.

Zinat Mortazavi : Reviewer

16 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,
The findings of this article are like a report from an inspection, and unfortunately, the presentation of the results for publication in this journal is not appropriate.

Edris Bazrafshan : Reviewer

8 Aug 2018

This manuscript presents “RISK ASSESSMENT FOR CONSUMPTION OF CANNED TUNA AND FISH IN TIJUANA, MEXICO”. This is an article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests, but some modifications are needed before it's accepted for possible publication.
- Key words must be selected from the Mesh; please revise them.
- Please insert the values of all RfD of heavy metals in your manuscript.

- Various abbreviations were used in the manuscript. Please describe these abbreviations for the first time.

- Some of the parameters used for equations in the manuscript must be described after each equation.
- Discussion is weak. The authors should compare their data with that of other published works to bring about the advantages of this process (preferably in a Table). In fact, the risk of heavy metals has not been described very good.
- Please add some new and relevant studies about the health effects of heavy metals in consumed canned fish to improve the quality of the discussion.
- My final decision is major revision.

Edris Bazrafshan : Associate Editor

8 Aug 2018

Comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Keywords are not suitable, revise them (Select them from Mesh).
- There are language problems and writing problems in this manuscript, Manuscript needs to be revised.
- Correct the ingestion rate of fish. “11.4 kg per capita” is false. It seems to be 11.4 kg/capita. year
- Please describe all of the abbreviations for first time in abstract. What does GBC stand for?
- Integrate all parts of the material and methods into one part
- What does this sentence mean: “Calibration blanks and method blanks were below the method detection limit”?
- Add the maximum permissible limit (MPL) of the Mexican standard, the European Union (EU) standard in tables 3 and 4.
- Revise the “Cf is the conversion factor of 103 kg/g”.
- Describe all parameters of each equation after that equation.
- Write all RfD of heavy metals in the manuscript and in a table.
- You wrote the EF is 365. Do people consume fish and tuna every day? EF is changed according to the habits of people and the consumption of fish. EF refers to the days that people are exposed to the contaminant(here EF is fish and tuna)
- Why did you write “the total annual fish consumption of 1.23 kg/year per capita” in the description section of the formula?
- Why did you write the IR=3.4 g/day while you mentioned fish consumption is 11.4 kg/capita?
- This statement is not true” ….or consumption dose of fish….” in Characterization of health risk section.
- “C is wet weight in mg/kg” is not true. C is the concentration of contaminant in fish or tuna.
- “Cf is the conversion factor.” It seems to be 1000
- Change “target hazard quotient (THQ)” into “hazard quotient (HQ)” in the manuscript
- Change Cf, Ef, and Rf into the CF, E, F, and RF, respectively
- Sum all HQ of metals and make a THQ parameter (total hazard quotient) for all metals, and add that to the table. (refer to a few health risk articles)
- Characterization of health risk doesn’t have a good discussion. Improve that and

compare data, and describe the risk
Reviewer 2:
The article was studied, but the results are suitable for publication in a local journal and are not suitable for publication in this journal.

Reviewer 3:
This manuscript presents “RISK ASSESSMENT FOR CONSUMPTION OF CANNED TUNA AND FISH IN TIJUANA, MEXICO”. This is an article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests, but some modifications are needed before it's accepted for possible publication.
- Key words must be selected from Mesh; please revise them.
- Please insert the values of all RfD of heavy metals in your manuscript.

- Various abbreviations were used in the manuscript. Please describe these abbreviations for the first time.
- Some of the parameters used for equations in the manuscript must be described after each equation.
- Discussion is weak. The authors should compare their data with that of other published works to bring about the advantages of this process (preferably in a Table). In fact, the risk of heavy metals has not been described very good.
- Please add some new and relevant studies about the health effects of heavy metals in consumed canned fish to improve the quality of the discussion.
- my final decision is major revision.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

12 Aug 2018

Dear Author
Manuscript status
Major revision
Please check your attachment.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

REVIEWER 1´S COMMENTS	REPLY
Keywords must be selected from Mesh; please revise them.	New keywords were added using the suggestion given by the the online resource MeSH®on demand NEW KEYWORDS: tuna; sharks; mercury; dietary exposure: Metals, heavy
Please insert the values of all RfD of heavy metals in your manuscript.	The RfD used were inserted in the mansucript. P 9.
Various abbreviations were used in the manuscript. Please describe these abbreviations for first time.	The abbreviation used were defined.
Some of the parameters used for equations in the manuscript must describe after each equation.	The parameters used in the equations were describe after each equation
Discussion is weak. The authors should compare their data with that of other published works to bring about the advantages of this process (preferably in a Table). In fact, the risk of heavy metals has not been described very good.	Table 5 was made again and the results of other studies were added. A discussion were added in P 10.
Please add some new and relevant studies about the health effects of heavy metals in consumed canned fish to improve the quality of the discussion.	A pharagraph was added in P10
REVIEWER 2´S COMMENTS	REPLY
Keywords are not suitable, revise them (Select them from Mesh).	Keywords are not suitable, revise them (Select them from Mesh). New keywords were added using the suggestions given by the online resource MeSH®on demand NEW KEYWORDS: tuna; sharks; mercury; dietary exposure: Metals, heavy
There are language problems and writing problems in this manuscript, Manuscript needs to be revised.	The manuscript was revised by a language company
Correct the ingestion rate of fish. “11.4 kg per capita” is false. It seems to be 11.4 kg / capita. Year	The correction was made
Please describe all of the	The description of the abbreviation

abbreviations for first time in abstract. What does GBC stand up?	was made. GB is not an abbreviation is the name of the company that manufactured the equipment
Integrate all parts of material and methods into one part	The methods and the materials part has been integrated into one part
What does this sentence mean “Calibration blanks and method blanks were below the method detection limit”?	This is a measure of the quality of your chemicals used in your analysis. That means that in the calibration and analyzes there was no contamination of the target analyte by the chemical used or the environment in the lab. Significa que la señal de fondo generada por el instrumento de medición no está por encima de la concentración mínima que puede ser detectada por el instrumento, ejemplo: el resultado del blanco de método para pb en una muestra es de 0.00014 mg/kg este valor se encuentra por debajo del LD del método.
Add the maximum permissible limit (MPL) of the Mexican standard, the European Union (EU) standard, in tables 3 and 4.	The MPLs were added in Tables 3 and 4
Revise the “Cf is the conversion factor of 103 kg/g”.	There was an error it must be 10^{-3} which is a conversión factor from mg/kg to mg/g. The corrections were made
Describe all parameters of each equation after that equation.	The description of parameter has been made
Write all RfD of heavy metals in the manuscript and in a table	RfD values were added in the manuscript on page 9
- You wrote the EF is 365. Do people consume fish and tuna every day? EF is adjusted according to people's habits and the number of days they consume fish. EF refers to the days that people are exposed to the contaminant(here EF is fish and tuna).	This number represents the worst-case scenario or the less optimistic case. This number has also been used by other authors such as Barone et al. 2015; Lopez-Barrera et al 2016
Why did you write “the total annual fish consumption of 1.23 kg/year per capita” in the section on formula?	This figure was the consumption of canned tuna in Mexico, which was taken from official data reported by the National Commission of Fisheries of Mexico
Why did you write the IR=3.4 g/day	The Figure of 11.4 kg/year per capita

while you mentioned fish consumption is 11.4 kg/capita?	encompasses al kind of fish. The figure of 3.4 g/day is the result of divide 1.23 kg (1230 g) between 365 days .
This statement is not true" ….or consumption dose of fish…." in the Characterization of health risk section.	This term was erased
"C is wet weight in mg/kg" is not true. C is the concentration of contaminant in fish or tuna.	Correction was made in the manuscript
"Cf is the conversion factor" it seems to be 1000	CF has a value of 10^{-3} (0.001)
change "target hazard quotient (THQ)" into "hazard quotient (HQ)" in manuscript	The change has been made
Change Cf, Ef, and Rf into the CF, E, F, and RF, respectively	The changes have been made in the manuscript
Sum all HQ of metals and make a THQ parameter (total hazard quotient) for all metals, and add that to the table. (refer to a few health risk articles)Changes have been made. Table 5 was changed, and the TQH were added, as well as the results of other risk articles	Changes have been made. Table 5 was change and the TQH were added, as well as the results of other risk articles
Characterization of health risk doesn't have a good discussion. Improve that and compare data, and describe the risk.	A discussion of health risks was added, and results from other studies were added in Table 5.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Edris Bazrafshan : Reviewer — 2 Oct 2018

Dear associate editor,
The authors have revised their manuscript based on the comments of reviewers. I decide to accept.

Hossein Kamani : Reviewer — 1 Nov 2018

Dear Editor, my comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Change the title into “Health risk assessment of some heavy metals from canned tuna and fish in Tijuana, Mexico.
- Write about the health risk in the methods and results sections of the abstract.
- Substitute the keywords with “ heavy metal, health risk assessment, fish, tuna
- Which certified reference samples did you use? Is it standard? If you used standard references, please write their concentration in Table 1.
- What does “fortified samples” refer to?
- Why is EF equal to 365 days? How many days per year do people consume fish or tuna?
- The language of the manuscript needs to be revised.
- A few articles in the health scope related to the this study that you can use in the introduction and in the calculation of health risk

Best regards,

Edris Bazrafshan : Associate Editor — 8 Dec 2018

Dear Authors,
The comments of reviewers about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Change the title into “Health risk assessment of some heavy metals from canned tuna and fish in Tijuana, Mexico.
- Write about the health risk in the methods and results sections of the abstract.
- Substitute the keywords with “ heavy metal, health risk assessment, fish, tuna
- Which certified reference samples did you use? Is it standard? If you used standard references, please write their concentration in Table 1.
- What does “fortified samples” refer to?
- Why is EF equal to 365 days? How many days per year do people consume fish or tuna?
- The language of the manuscript needs to be revised.

- A few articles in the health scope related to this study that you can use in the introduction and in the calculation of health risk.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

9 Dec 2018

Dear Authors,
The comments of reviewers about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Change the title into “Health risk assessment of some heavy metals from canned tuna and fish in Tijuana, Mexico
- Write about the health risk in the methods and results sections of the abstract.
- Substitute the keywords with “ heavy metal, health risk assessment, fish, tuna
- Which certified reference samples did you use? Is it standard? If you used standard references, please write their concentration in Table 1.
- What does “fortified samples” refer to?
- Why is EF equal to 365 days? How many days per year do people consume fish or tuna?
- The language of the manuscript needs to be revised.
- A few articles in the health scope related to this study that you can use in the introduction and in the calculation of health risk.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Reviewer 2´s Comments:	
Change the title into “Health risk assessment of some heavy metals from canned tuna and fish in Tijuana, Mexico.	The title was changed.
Write about the health risk in the methods and results sections of the abstract.	Short sentences were added in the abstract section.
Substitute the keywords with “heavy metal, health risk assessment, fish, and tuna.	The suggested keywords were added: heavy metal, health risk assessment, fish, and tuna.
Which certified reference samples did you use? Is it standard? If you used standard references, please write their concentration in Table 1.	The names of the standard reference materials have been written and their concentrations.
What does “fortified samples” refer to?	A fortified sample means adding a known concentration of the analytes of interest, to determine interferences due to the matrix and recovery.
Why is EF equal to 365 days? How many days per year do people consume fish or tuna?	This number represents the worst-case scenario or the less optimistic case. This number has also been used by other authors such as Barone et al. 2015; Lopez-Barrera et al 2016.A short explaining sentence was added in P 9.
The language of the manuscript needs to be revised.	Language was revised.
A few articles in the health scope related to this study that you can use in the introduction and in the calculation of health risk.	Two references of Health Scope related to health risk have been added.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Edris Bazrafshan : Reviewer — 12 Feb 2019

Dear associate editor,
The authors have revised their manuscript based on the comments of reviewers. Hence, I have decided to accept this manuscript.
Best regards,

Edris Bazrafshan : Associate Editor — 12 Feb 2019

Dear Authors,
Based on the comments of the associate editor and reviewer, this manuscript can be accepted for publication in this Journal at its current status.
Best Regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 14 Feb 2019

Dear author,
Based on the comments of the associate editor and reviewer, this manuscript has been accepted for publication in this Journal.
Best Regards,