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	It appears the samples were only collected once. While this is acceptable for the wells, it has less vakue 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. I would like to see more thought given to why there were differences among the wells and especially among the streams. The season and conditions should be given. More analysis would help. Why are there differences among the samples Does the geology of the region make a difference? What other factors could explain the differenced	
Minor REVISION comments	There are several places where the subject verb tenses are not correct Many words are capitalized that do not need to be I have marked some in the abstract and introduction. This should be checked throughout the manuscript. I have ignored these, but they should be checked throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Yhr procedure is sound, but it is difficult to follow in places. Revision would help here. Experimental could use some revision	

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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tom DeVore**
Department, University & Country	**James Madison University, USA**