

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 (<i>Cola nitida</i> 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	<p>(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.</p> <p>(2) Please summarize the advantages and disadvantages of this method and its scope of application by comparing other analysis methods.</p> <p>(3)The readability of this article is poor, and the language is needed to improve extensively to meet the journal publication standard.</p> <p>(4) Add standard Solution Preparation subtitle. How you prepared stock solution, intermediate solution and working solution???</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(7) Why only decided use MRLs set by EU? As we know, The residue limit set by Codex Alimentarius of WHO/FAO the most acceptable one in the world. So, you have also compare the results with this MRLS (CAC)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>(1) It is strange that all chemical measurements in the text didn't have significant digits.</p> <p>(2)The use of concentration units did not follow the standard.</p> <p>(3) As we now QuEChERS method have both extraction and clean up procedures but, nothing is written on this especially about clean up.</p> <p>(4) How you prepared the samples for further extraction?? You need to dry, grind and etc....</p> <p>I suggest add a table with the ions monitored for quantification and qualification (identification) for each analyte, and their respective retention time.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>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:</p> <p>See the attachment (main document)</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jafer Siraj
Department, University & Country	Mizan-Tepi University, Ethiopia