

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	

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>1. The title of the manuscript is very attractive and important for scientific community who are working in this field. But the overall study and adjective mentioned here are not as informative as claimed in the title.</p> <p>2. Not fully applicable since the author claim in title the 'Risk assessment of residual pesticides of Phaseolus Vulgaris L. consumed in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria', but focus on the GC value of applied pesticides in the 4 varieties of beans. No evidence of any clinical trials of the adverse effect of pesticides on human body found here.</p> <p>3. Abstract is inclusive not need any modification.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is acceptable but data of some experimental studies / or some pictures/ or plots should be incorporated.</p> <p>5. In this manuscript a details findings of concentration (found from GC data) of different residual pesticides applied in 4 types of beans and their EDI and HRI values are mention in tabular form and the probable toxic effects due to human consumption of those 4 beans are predicted here. But no experimental evidences are found in this manuscript such as any spectroscopic data/ any concentration limit data / any experimental evidences of biological / biochemical effect (such as ref. 8) of pesticides, are mentioned for authenticity. Hence the manuscript is scientifically weak. Need to provide some experimental evidences such as picture spectra, plots like GCMS data (such as ref. 10, 24) for the pesticides mentioned here in the tables.</p> <p>6. For this type of study related to health risk factor from vegetation only 25 references are not sufficient and some additional references having recent study (after 2020) on this field in Nigeria/ or in the continent should be incorporated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract, Key words are as per the title. Method of sampling and process of extraction and study are well explained.</p> <p>Need Clarification of the pesticide 2-4-dichloro in terms of chemical nature.</p> <p>The scientific work mentioned here are very much similar and not so much information found as claimed in the title and many more similar types of study on this topic in the particular area of Nigeria can be in different published article</p> <p>Here only HRI index of different pesticide residue is mentioned, since many pesticides have their carcinogenic effect, hence CBC index should be provided.</p> <p>There are some typographic mistakes highlighted in the manuscript which should be rectified.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ujjwal Das
Department, University & Country	Sarsuna College, University of Calcutta, India