

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJBCRR_126048 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | RESEARCH OF PESTICIDES IN FRUITS AND VEGETABLES GROWN IN THE DISTRICT OF ABIDJAN, IVORY COAST |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION 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> |
|---|--|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of pesticide residues in commonly consumed vegetables, which has direct implications for public health.➤ The results cannot be generalised but the study contributes valuable data that can inform policy decisions and safety regulations as it pertains to the district of Abidjan.➤ The work can be further improved by incorporating health risk estimation to know if the detected residues pose potential health risks to consumers | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Assessment of Pesticide Residues in Fruits and vegetables grown in Abidjan, Ivory Coast or Assessment of Pesticide Residues in market garden products from Abidjan, Ivory Coast | Assessment of Pesticide Residues in Fruits and vegetables grown in Abidjan, Ivory Coast |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The abstract does not clearly reflect the methodology and key findings presented in the main body of the work. These risks misleading the reader.➤ Clarification is needed on whether organochlorine pesticides were actually detected, as their mention in the abstract is ambiguous.➤ Which analytical technique (GC-MS or HPLC) was employed to generate the results needs to be clearly stated, as the methods and abstract currently provide inconsistent information.➤ Precise terminology should be used to describe what was detected. Were these pesticide "compounds" or "molecules"? or residues?➤ The word "specialties" is non-standard scientific terminology and does not effectively convey the type of pesticide brands or types. | Organochlorine pesticides were indeed detected (Metazachlor, Metolachlor, Terbutryn). Pesticide residues were identified and quantified by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC-UV) technique. These were pesticide residues agrochemicals |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is scientifically okay as it employed established methods for pesticide residue analysis such as the use of the QuEchERS method. The discussion effectively contextualizes the findings within existing research, highlighting both similarities and differences with other studies. It can still be improved by stating possible sources of the residues detected in the vegetables. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. : | The references included recent studies. However, author needs to incorporate more recent global studies on pesticide residues in vegetables. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | <div>1. Clarify which analytical method (HPLC or GC-MS) was actually used, as the methods and abstract sections provide contradictory information.</div> <div>2. It may be more informative to compare detected pesticide residues levels to established maximum residue limits (MRLs), such as those set by the WHO, EU or your country's regulatory body. This would help evaluate if residue levels are within acceptable limits.</div> <div>3. Consider including a health risk analysis to provide useful information about potential risks to consumer health from eating produce with detected residues.</div> <div>4. Provide details on the instrument's limit of detection and describe the standard reference materials used to generate calibration curves for pesticide quantification. This information is needed to interpret the results.</div> <div>5. Use italic formatting for scientific names of vegetables consistently throughout for clarity.</div> <div>6. Carefully proofread and edit the writing to correct any grammatical errors or inconsistent syntax which could reduce understandability. Also check for any non-English terms that were overlooked.</div> <div>7. Standardize the in-text citation style (numerical or author-date) to improve coherence and conform with a single formatting guideline.</div> | <div>1. chromatographie en phase liquide à haute performance (HPLC-UV).</div> <div>3. a health risk analysis would be possible for a future study</div> |

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) | No, this manuscript does not contain ethical problems. |