

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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses an important issue in food safety and nutrition by investigating the impact of pesticide contamination (Sniper/Dichlorvos) and cooking methods on the chemical profile of beans. It contributes valuable insights into the dual effects of contamination and processing on nutritional and safety aspects, making it highly relevant to public health and food safety research.	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be refined for brevity: "Impact of Dichlorvos Contamination and Cooking Methods on the Chemical Profile of Beans: A GC-MS Analysis."	ok
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from greater clarity in presenting key findings. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Quantify the changes in chemical composition due to contamination and cooking.</li><li>- Highlight the most significant findings related to public health implications.</li></ul>	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound overall, with a robust methodology using GC-MS analysis to evaluate the chemical profiles. However, several points require clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Provide more details on the experimental design, particularly the sampling strategy and controls used for contamination.</li><li>- Clarify the statistical methods applied to ensure the validity of the results.</li></ul>	Noted and revised
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and include recent literature. However, adding more recent studies on the effects of pesticides and cooking on nutritional quality would strengthen the discussion.	Done
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally clear, but some sections contain grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. A thorough proofreading by a native English speaker is recommended.	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The discussion could better integrate the implications of the findings for food processing industries and public health.</li><li>- Consider including recommendations for mitigating the effects of dichlorvos contamination in beans.</li></ul>	Thanks for the comments.

Review Form 3

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	