

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_105759
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk assessment of residual pesticides of Phaseolus Vulgaris L. consumed in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article is important because we need to have the knowledge of how healthy the food, we are consuming is</p> <p>yes</p> <p>no, there is no information on the statistical analysis</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes, there is no wrong or right research if it has not been proven otherwise by other authors.</p> <p>References are recent enough but the author is not consistent about format of listing</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, very simple and clear</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No hypotheses were tested in the article, no correlational studies and figures representation of the results would have been better.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Temitope Ruth Folorunso
Department, University & Country	College of Forestry, Wildlife and Environment, Auburn University, United States