

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?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Comments:	
	1. The authors have chosen a topic important with respect to not only human health but also of environmental concern.	Noted
	2. The manuscript is well written but needs thorough revision before accepted for publication.	
	3. There are many typographical as well as punctuation errors which need to be taken care off.	Effectuated the revision
	4. The references are not quoted properly. Uniformity should be maintained.	
	5. The results and discussion section need to be concise and thus should be rewritten.	
	6. The references quoted do not follow any pattern. The pattern of journal and uniformity in writing references should be strictly maintained.	Noted and effectuated
	7. The language corrections are required.	Revision made

Noted

Effectted the revision

Noted and effected

Revision made

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