SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOPACS_35001**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Determination of Pesticide Residues in Edible Crops and Soil from University of Agriculture Makurdi Farm Nigeria Part 1 in the series of pesticide residues**
Type of Article:	**Original Research Paper**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
The author made an effort in the manuscript corrections however lacks of sufficient data or tests in section of results. In addition, the terminology used in the paper is not in analytical chemistry in many parts, that is, in specific phraseology.	Data presented are summarized version of results in terms of mean etc and not an individual result to save space. Terminology used that are not in analytical chemistry are not mentioned or specified.
It is necessary to carry out an exhaustive analysis in the Soil Analytical parameters section, are missing something points of the analytical chemistry, data treatment, lack of evidences in the validation method, reason why in spite of the realized changes some points are missing in the manuscript and lack of the important aspects of analytical chemistry its evident, so they must be completed properly for publication.	Since the core sense of the research was on pesticide accumulation/dissemination, only very important soil physicochemical parameters were analysed. However. The suggestion would be considered in subsequent work. More analytical evidences have been added.
However, looking at the manuscript in its current state. It is probably best to check and resubmit.	
1. Section 4. Are missing analytical parameters in a table such as LOD, LOQ, correlation coefficient, slope, repeatability inter- and intra-day at two concentration levels. 2. Section 4. 6 Describe the mean concentration, deviation, explain how is posisible obtain deviation of 0, if exist the human mistakes, the use of crystal material, and any determination process always provide the spread of error. 3. Section 4. Figure 4. The signal assignation according with the Chromatogram is very confuse because some analytes don't show a signal higher that the signal/noise ratio and result confuse how the author made the assignation respectively. 4. Please check signal/noise ratio according to the IUPAC, and take into account for the validation method. 4. Please provide the MRLs in the analysis of pesticides in crops according with a normative regulation. 5. Please check the handbook of Chemometrics by Elsevier.	1.The analytical parameters have been supplied i.e LOD, correlation coefficient, slope, regression equation etc Since 10 X SD (standard deviation of instrument blank) gives LOQ, and the blank readings were 0,0. That is why LOQ was not specifically mentioned. 2. That happens in *Daucus carota* for Alpha-HCH, pendimethalin & propanil (table 6 & a few others in table 7) because, the values of the two readings replicated were the same for the few crops such that the mean values were also the same and so, no standard deviation because of that I assigned o value to it but if you are not comfortable with that, the 0 value may be removed. 3&4: The chromatogram which seem not too clear have been deleted and replaced with other analytical parameters. The signal/noise ratio has been adjusted using the blank signal, others are signals above this peak 4. Some MRLs in crops are quite available, they are not included here for want of space i.e cypermethrin in fruits or berries is 0.1mg/kg & 0.2 mg/kg in roots or rhizomes; endosulfan in fruits & berries is 5 mg/kg & 0.5 mg/kg in rhizomes based on CODEX international Food Standard, 2012.