

Paper: “Negative Effect of Lambda-cyhalothrin (Insecticide) on Alazani River Fish, Luciobarbus Mursa”

Submitted: 01 March 2022

Accepted: 29 July 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Magda Davitashvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N. Ghosh
West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 2: Tea Museliani
European University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Luis Angel Medina-Juarez
Universidad de Sonora, México

Reviewer 4: Daniel B. N. Kenko
University of Buea, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Daniel B. N. Kenko	
University/Country: University of Buea / Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/03/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/03/2022
Manuscript Title: Negative effect of oxidative stress caused by pesticides on the Alazani river fish Mursa (Barbus Mursa)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0332/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>The title is not very informative. I have made suggestions for a new title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Very scanty abstract lacking many key items.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Many grammatical errors, serious problem with punctuation.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>Poor methodology, no mention of the study site, no map nor GPS coordinate of the study site, methods poorly described and still unclear. Data processing and analysis unclear.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Results are good but not well described.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Not supported by the content of the manuscript. Should be redone. Recommendations should be added and there should be a conclusion for each specific objective.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Authors should carefully read INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS to format their citations and references</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This work is a good contribution to ecotoxicology, good results obtained but manuscript drafted with precipitation. The paper should be carefully restructured and proof-read.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

NO COMMENTS

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Luis Angel Medina-Juarez	
University/Country: Universidad de Sonora / México.	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/03/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/03/2022
Manuscript Title: Negative effect of oxidative stress caused by pesticides on the Alazani river fish Mursa (<i>Barbus Mursa</i>)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.03.2022 (1)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The methodology used is not appropriate to support this title</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The methodology used is not enough to support the results shown in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Editing and grammar review required</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The methodology is not clear. A detailed explanation of obtaining the sampled tissues and their analysis is required. Also, to explain the experiments performed at 5 and 10 days.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results are justified with information on contamination from 2013 and not the current one. On the other hand, the results show studies carried out at 5 and 10 days, these are not explained in methodology.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The results do not clearly show the effect at the cellular and molecular level mentioned in the conclusion. Rewrite the conclusion including only the results shown in the manuscript.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>It is mentioned in the manuscript that: “Most modern pesticides are highly toxic compounds for the components of ecological systems. [Beruchashvili, N. L 2000, Chantladze Z.I. 1997]”. It is not modern information on pesticides that published in 2000 or 1997, for an article that will be published in the year 2022.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The methodology needs to be improved. In addition, it is required to carry out the discussion of results using recently published works.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This manuscript is supported by very old information. The methodology is not up to date. It is recommended to request a rewrite

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Tea Museliani	
University/Country: European University /Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.03.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 18.03.2022
Manuscript Title: Negative effect of oxidative stress caused by pesticides on the Alazani river fish Mursa (<i>Barbus Mursa</i>)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0332/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The methods are not presented in the abstract, but the results of the work are given.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methods are not explained clearly, but the methods are consistent with the work performed	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results obtained are of scientific value and important because they clearly reflect the negative impact of pesticides on the environment.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is not clear, needed more specification and recommendations	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate, but are old</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I advise the authors to use the latest references and if possible to correct them, to present the conclusions more clearly as they have obtained significant results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. N. Ghosh	
University/Country: West Texas A&M University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: March, 7, 22	Date Review Report Submitted: March 11, 2022
Manuscript Title: Negative effect of oxidative stress caused by pesticides on the Alazani river fish Mursa (<i>Barbus Mursa</i>)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0332/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Last page sentence framing corrections added.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please read the reviewed manuscript and make the necessary corrections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Good work! Important information on toxicology of pesticide.

