

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_94831
Title of the Manuscript:	MONITORING OF PESTICIDE CONTAMINATION OF SELECTED LEGUME SAMPLES IMPORTED IN UAE
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract does not follow the standard format i.e. background information missing, methodology, results and key recommendation. The objective of this study was not clear?</p> <p>These maximum residue limits (MRLs) are not indicated, neither what was found indicated in the findings nor in summary at the abstract</p> <p>Allowable limits (MRLs) according to UAE Mandatory Standard (UAE.S MRL 1:2019), These are also not indicated, there is need to do that while reporting results so that the reader may be able to judge what was being compared?</p> <p>How many ports of entry were the sampled obtained?</p> <p>The section on method of validation should not be reported in the results but rather under methodology.</p> <p>The author keeps on referring to the legislation in force, what about it? What are the Permissible levels? What are the quantifiable levels that were found in this study? Such is not seen throughout the document. There is need to report results. What is basically reported are proportions or percentages of those exceeding the PEL values.</p> <p>The authors conclude by saying that, this monitoring program quantified the amount pesticide residues in imported some legume crops. This cannot be seen throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The authors need to use some aspect of descriptive and inferential statistics in reporting these results in order for the study to have a better scientific contribution.</p> <p>The laboratory procedures/methodology is well reported</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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Was this work/study a normal / routine monitoring by the Ministry? Have the ministry authorised to share the findings of such routine monitoring? Doesn't the ministry have mechanisms of reporting such findings? Can this not be an ethical concern within the jurisdiction?</p> <p>Were the authors working as ministry staff or doing an independent study?</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alfred Owino Odongo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Public Health, Mount Kenya University, Kenya</b>