

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_130325
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF SPRAYER RINSING WATER IN RICE PLOTS IN THE YAMO USSOUKRO REGION, Ivory Coast
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>

Review Form 3

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.	Authors sought to characterize spray rinse waters used in agricultural plots in Ivory Coast through identifying present plant residues. These are essential for controlling diseases, insects, pests, and weeds. This study is timely and relevant in sustainable agriculture. The focus of the study is topical, and the methodology applied is appropriate to objectively achieve the study goal. There flow of the manuscript is adequate with a good readability and composition.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate. However, for consistency, Ivory Coast should be capitalized.	
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.	The abstract is self-sufficient.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The introduction provides a good background. However, citations within the text should be continuous, and words like highlighted, according to, as noted, etc. should not be used unless it is necessary. The objectives are clear. The methodology is well-described and detailed. Figures are well presented and captioned. However, authors should use pattern fill instead of solid fill. Data support conclusions concisely.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are appropriate, sufficient, recent, and relevant.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors should revise the manuscript to correct minor grammatical and typographical errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bonface O. Manono
Department, University & Country	Colorado State University, And South Eastern Kenya University, USA