Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Biotechnology Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJI_76743**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Temporal evolution of organochlorine pesticides residues in kola nuts (Cola nitida vent nuts. Schott & Endl.) processing in Eastern of Côte d'Ivoire**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	(1) The key analytical tool in this article is GC-MS, but there are no chromatograms and mass spectra of the relevant samples in the article. Please add relevant figures. (2) Please summarize the advantages and disadvantages of this method and its scope of application by comparing other analysis methods. (3)The readability of this article is poor, and the language is needed to improve extensively to meet the journal publication standard. (4) Add standard Solution Preparation subtitle. How you prepared stock solution, intermediate solution and working solution??? (5) You have failed to present **Analytical Method Validation parts including recovery study, calibration curve, limit of detection, limit of quantification and etc. which are the crucial parts in pesticide residue analysis. Without limit of detection, how you detected the pesticide residues? Add a table for method validation information.** (6)The standard deviation is much higher in most of your result which indicate the presence of errors in your result. Would you justify this phenomenon? (7) Why only decideduse MRLs set by EU? As we know, The residue limit set by Codex Alementarious of WHO/FAO the most acceptable one in the world. So, you have also compare the results with this MRLS (CAC)	1) Not necessary as this is not a method validation study. multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) have been add in the manuscript 2) See Analytical Methods, 2013, 5, 5875 3) Correction have been made in the manuscript 4) The method used in this study is a reference method. 5) The objective of this study is not to develop a method of analysis. In this context, Validation parts including recovery study, calibration curve, limit of detection, limit of quantification and etc. is not necessary. The differences are quite large in most cases because data takes into account all the samples analyzed during 3 campaigns. Some samples show no presence of residues, while others do. The dispersion is therefore much greater. RSD increased somewhat as concentration decreased. Moreover the conversion of the units of mg/kg dry weight to µg/kg fresh weight makes more important the standard deviations The EU-MRLs chosen in this study are specific to kola nuts and cocoa beans unlike the general case exposed by the ADIs of Codex Alimentarus
Minor REVISION comments	(1) It is strange that all chemical measurements in the text didn't have significant digits. (2)The use of concentration units did not follow the standard. (3) As we now QuEChERS method have both extraction and clean up procedures but, nothing is written on this especially about clean up. (4) How you prepared the samples for further extraction?? You need to dry, grind and etc.... I suggest add a table with the ions monitored for quantification and qualification (identification) for each analyte, and their respective retention time	2) Data were expressed in µg / kg wet weight because kola nuts are generally consumed fresh (90%). This better reflects the risk incurred by consumers 3) The method used is a reference method. It has been added to the manuscript 4) See method used: ***Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences, 2(4): 1-11, 2017; Article no.AJOCS.34401*** ***ISSN: 2456-7795*** Table have been add in the manuscript

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	In this study, the authors combined QuEChERS and GC-MS to analyze pesticide residues in in kola nuts (Cola nitida vent nuts. Schott & Endl.) processing in Eastern of Côte d'Ivoire. Results showed that all 21 pesticides analyzed were detected in kola nuts samples. Therefore, the authors recommended that there is the need to keep monitoring ecotoxicological chemical substances in kola nuts produced in Côte d'Ivoire and take steps that ensure health safety of end users. Major revision is recommended to address the above issues: See the attachment (main document)	

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)*	