GLOBAL PRESS HUB

**GPH Review Form**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Biosciences |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJORIB_1533** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **RESPONSE OF SOME MICROORGANISMS, EARTHWORMS AND SNAILS TO PESTICIDES (CARBOFURAN AND PARAQUAT) UNDER TROPICAL CONDITIONS** |
| 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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments<br><br>**1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?**<br><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>**2. Is the title of the article suitable?**<br><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>**3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?**<br><br>**4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**<br><br>**5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**<br><br>**6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.**<br><br>**(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)** | The manuscript is of value to the scientific community<br><br>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.<br><br>The abstract is not comprehensive especially for the methods and results.<br><br>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.<br><br>The manuscript is scientifically correct.<br><br>The references are sufficient; however, some references are more than 10 years old.<br><br>The exposure periods were not consistent – snails and earthworms were exposed for 14 days, whilst microorganisms were exposed for 8 weeks. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments<br><br>**1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The quality of the English needs to be improved to be suitable for scholarly communications | |
| **Optional/General** comments | 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. | |

**GPH Review Form**

**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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Joanna B. Change** |
| Department, University & Country | **National University of Science and Technology, Zimbabwe** |