

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_87828
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Organochlorine Pesticide Residues and Trace Metal Concentration in Well and Stream waters from Agricultural Farm Settlement in Ile-Oluji, Ondo State
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>It appears the samples were only collected once. While this is acceptable for the wells, it has less value for the streams which can change rapidly from climate changes such as rain, recent applications, etc. It is common for this type of study to collect data over a period of time to determine how it changes with the seasons, the growing cycle, etc. The conditions when the data was collected should be included.</p> <p>I would like to see more thought given to why there were differences among the wells and especially among the streams.</p> <p>The season and conditions should be given.</p> <p>More analysis would help. Why are there differences among the samples</p> <p>Does the geology of the region make a difference?</p> <p>What other factors could explain the difference?</p>	<p>The samples were collected at randomly along the stream in replicate. The sampling was design in a form that will obtain data based on the concentration of the analyte at that particular point. This sampling was done during the dry season, the next stage of the study is take samples during the dry and rainy season sampling along different point on the stream.</p> <p>The geology of the place does not make a difference but the level of the pollution from the different agricultural activities at each point account for the difference.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are several places where the subject verb tenses are not correct</p> <p>Many words are capitalized that do not need to be</p> <p>I have marked some in the abstract and introduction. This should be checked throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>I have ignored these, but they should be checked throughout the manuscript.</p>	<p>This has been checked and corrected in the manuscript</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Yhr procedure is sound, but it is difficult to follow in places. Revision would help here.</p> <p>Experimental could use some revision</p>	<p>This has been checked and corrected in the manuscript</p>

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	