SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_35005**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ASSESSMENT OF PESTICIDE RESIDUE LEVELS IN SELECTED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES SOLD IN SOME MAJOR MARKETS IN IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA**
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	**The authors should attend to these concerns:** **1. The research question is not mentioned. State the research questions the study sought to answer. Some examples have been given in the text.** **2. specify if the sampling was done consecutively for four weeks or every two weeks etc** **3. - specify the day of collection: why this particular day - perhaps it is a big market day with fresh arrivals of vegetables** **4. -specify the year/month that this study was conducted. It is important for further comprehension** **5. - can you explain why these particular fruits and vegetables were selected for this study? it could have been tomatoes, eggplant etc. (my opinion: maybe some other researcher has already done that, maybe because the selected fruits and vegetables are found in the market all year round - i am just suggesting)** **6. Can you justify why you are focusing just on dichlorvos and endosulfan? to the best of my knowledge fruit and vegetable production utilises a lot of pyrethroid base pesticides (allethrin, tetramethrin, permethrin, cypermethrin, deltamethrin, lambda-cyhalothrin, fenvalerate etc) and others.** **7. Provide a table showing the observed residue level and the max residue limit by FEPA, EU**	

and FAO/WHO side by side for each fruit and vegetable. There are some differences in the recommended levels from these different organizations. So that we can easily see the differences clearly. This has implications in your discussion.

8. The data analysis is not clear;

a. A t-test was used to compare the residue level of endosufan and dichlorvos in vegetables. Then put a total mean of endosulfan and dichlorvos rsidue, t –value and p-value in a row after line 134

b. A t-test was used to compare the residue level of endosufan and dichlorvos in fruits. Then put a total mean of endosulfan and dichlorvos rsidue, t –value and p-value in a row after line 148

c. You need ANOVA analysis and a Post Hoc test in order to make this claim (line 109). There are four markets; each market serves as a treatment. Calculate the means of endosulfan and dichlorvos (the different fruits serve as replications) then run ANOVA and eventually Post Hoc test (DMRT, Turkey's etc) and provide a different table for results. Example below (you can use graph if you want – look up other articles)

Market	Mean of End	Mean of Dich
A	10a	
B	14b	
M		
S		

SDI Review Form 1.6

	9. Also state the statistical package that was used: SPSS, MINTAB, STATA, SAS etc	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Include fungicides in your list of pesticides (line 27) 2. Somewhere in the introduction/literature review, mention the max residue of common vegetables in Nigeria. 3. I think that the clean up section should come before 'Determination of Dichlorvos ... (Usually after extraction, you clean up the extract and then determine the pesticide residue amount). 4. Did you ask the sellers the source of their vegetables and fruits? It is important for the discussion, because you have made some claims in the discussion that could only have resulted from such questions. 5. Use updated version of acceptable MRL – 1996 is about 20yrs ago, a lot must have changed. 6. Line 185, 186 and 187 need references	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally good. The English is good. A few editorials were observed and corrected.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Anonymous***
Department, University & Country	***Dept. Plant Protection, Çukurova University, Turkey***