

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_96730
Title of the Manuscript:	Chromium Concentrations in Automotive Paints from Retail Stores in Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This article is very scientific and informative about the levels of chromium in the automotive paints commonly used by spray painters in Nairobi City.</p> <p>2. The article title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, however, the summarized details on how Cr concentrations were determined is missing in abstract</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct though, some improvement are needed, especially for the mentioned/highlighted parts before proceeding with its publication.</p> <p>6. Reference section is ok. but, I have suggested the author should re-check on some highlighted citations for correction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well written and has a scientific basis, however the following points mentioned in entire manuscript need revision and improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 1: the summarized methodology (and used equipment) on how Cr concentrations were determined is missing in the abstract. Page 6: TABLE1; the table caption should be put above of the table Page8: Table 2, the highlighted values are too high, kindly re-check, and for the significant values mentioned in the table, I suggest author uses letters(a,b,c) instead of asterisk Kindly, read the entire manuscript and work on the highlighted and raised issues <p>The article is good for publication, but of course it needs some improvement especially on the sections mentioned above. Therefore, the minor revision is required and as reviewer, I mark this article</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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Papias Nteziyaremye
Department, University & Country	Moi University, Kenya