

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_116563
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON THE PERSISTENCE OF PYRACLOSTROBIN 10% CS IN ACIDIC, NEUTRAL AND BASIC WATERS BY VALIDATED HPLC-DAD METHOD
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, considering data were generated, discussed and analysed in the course of the manuscript: which include: 1. Materials and method discussed extensively 2. Result extensively discussed as well as its validation methods 3. Figures and tables suitable for the subject matter. The Title is suitable: Suggestion: No: The abstract is comprehensive enough, summary of analysed result should be included.as well as methods used for analysis. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. Data treatment, tables and figures presented indicate the manuscript can be scientifically proven. Insufficient reference, (more references should be added)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chukwu Fidelis
Department, University & Country	Imo State University, Nigeria