

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130707
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of organophosphate pesticide residues and the associated risks of dietary exposure through selected vegetables from Ilala, Dar es Salaam
Type of the Article	Original 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The MS can be accepted for Publication after following revisions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The MS must be rewritten some statements are not very clear and there are several spelling mistakes.</li><li>2. Abstract, Introduction and Materials and Method part are too lengthy must be shorten.</li><li>3. There are some discrepancies in the references in the text and in reference part.</li><li>4. Some references are too old (2005) must be replaced by newer ones.</li></ol>	<p>Thanks</p> <p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Recent references added</p>

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)	