

## GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biosciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJORIB_1533</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>RESPONSE OF SOME MICROORGANISMS, EARTHWORMS AND SNAILS TO PESTICIDES (CARBOFURAN AND PARAQUAT) UNDER TROPICAL CONDITIONS</b>
Type of the Article	

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p>The manuscript is of value to the scientific community</p> <p>The title is not suitable. An assessment of the effect of pesticides carbofuran and paraquat on microbial diversity, earthworms and land snails in tropical areas.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive especially for the methods and results.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient; however, some references are more than 10 years old.</p> <p>The exposure periods were not consistent – snails and earthworms were exposed for 14 days, whilst microorganisms were exposed for 8 weeks.</p>	<p>I will prefer the title as the “effect of the pesticides (carbofuran and paraquat) on microbial population, earthworms and land snails under tropical conditions.”</p> <p>I think the information supplied is adequate as the abstract is restricted to 300 words. Any other unnecessary information are captured in-text.</p> <p>We have removed the most of the old references and added recent ones.</p> <p>There are no standard protocol for microbial assessment of pesticides toxicity like those prescribed by OECD and ISO. The researchers thought of the effect on a long term application of these pesticides on the soil microorganisms, hence, exposure periods are not same.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The quality of the English needs to be improved to be suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The Introduction section of the manuscript is too long. I noticed repetition of some points which was not necessary. For example “earthworms compose over 80% of terrestrial invertebrates.” Is written twice.</p>	<p>We have revised it, removed the repetitions and the introduction is reduced</p>



# GLOBAL PRESS HUB

---

[GPH Review Form](#)

**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>	