

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130091
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative GC-MS Analysis of the Chemical Profile of Beans (Phaseolus vulgaris): Impact of Sniper (Dichlorvos) Contamination and Cooking Methods
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>
Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article will help in identification and presence of beneficial natural components and harmful contaminants like organophosphate pesticide Dichlorvos. It will help to identify the need for improved post-harvest practices to ensure food safety and quality.	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Can be modified. The word sniper can be removed or put in brakets.	revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes the abstract is comprehensive	Thanks for the comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, But please make sure use good quality of the GC chromatograms	Thanks for the comments
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent but keep the reference style common	Ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor typing error are there.	Done
Optional/General comments	Can be published after certain modifications and specifically the good quality chromatograms. The discussion section can be improved.	Noted

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>	