



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBcRR_26439
Title of the Manuscript:	Multi-residue pesticides in conventional and organic orange
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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The scientific novelty should be well written i.e “ This study is aimed at monitoring the levels of pesticide residues in conventional and organic oranges imported from Egypt and South Africa ... etc 2. Rotavapor is wrong; the correction is rotary evaporator 3. Section 2.6; it should be pesticide residues 4. Section 2.6; it is Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometer (not spectrum) 5. MRL was mentioned in the results and discussion but there was no reference to it 6. Section 3.1.2: Residues found is wrong, it should be changed to “pesticide residues detected” 7. Section 3.1.2: the found pesticide is wrong, it should be changed to “the detected pesticide residues” 8. Conclusion should be on section 4 because section 3 is basically for results and discussion 9. More references are needed 10. Google earth map or a map of Al-Tamer vegetables market showing the sampling locations is necessary 11. The results and discussion of the scientific aspect must be clearer because this study looks like a technical report than a scientific article, therefore more references are needed for the justification of the results 12. “Tested pesticides” should be changed to	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“analyzed pesticide residues” 13. I believe the use of season in the results and discussion; conclusion; figure 2 and figure 4 is incorrect because samples were collected from the active production month from 2009 to 2011, therefore this is a monthly or yearly sampling, it is not a seasonal sampling i.e dry and rainy seasons or summer, winter and spring seasons 14. Figure 1 and 3 is irrelevant because the number of violating samples are clearly stated in tables 2 and 3	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Table: either make use of LOD or LOQ 2. Grammatical correction needed 3. The arrangement of the materials and methods should be as follows; 2.1 sampling, 2.2 sample preparation, 2.3 Reagents and equipment, 2.4 instrumentation, 2.5 Determination of pesticide residues, 2.6 Recovery 4. Gas Chromatography Electron Capture Detector is best used for the analysis of organochlorines 5. n-Hexane was not use for this experiment	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript is good	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akinawo Solomon
Department, University & Country	Department of chemistry, Federal University of Technology, Nigeria