

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_107713
Title of the Manuscript:	Systematic review on detection of Chlorpyrifos Herbicide Residues in Water resources, soil and Vegetable matrices: Remediation techniques.
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community because it provides knowledge about the detection of Chlorpyrifos in water, vegetables and fruits and soils and the possible amendments that can be made. Chlorpyrifos is a herbicide that causes environmental pollution and is potentially toxic to humans and animals. 2. The title ends with “:Remediation techniques” which infers that the manuscript focuses on this point, which is not correct, since a large part of the article describes the presence of Chlorpyrifos in waters, vegetables and fruits and soils, an alternative to The title could be: “Systematic review on detection of Chlorpyrifos Herbicide Residues in Water resources, soil and Vegetable matrices. Possible amendments” 3. Yes, it is comprehensive 4. The “REMEDICATION” subsections could be modified by: Possible amendments. Because this subsections describes remediation techniques and other actions than can be taken to reduce the presence of Chlorpyrifos in the environment. 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. <p>In INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More than one style of citation of references is used - Table 2 should be divided into two tables, separating the effects on human health from the damage to the ecosystem. In this way the table is confusing and has many blank spaces. - A table should be placed with minimum residual limits for Chlorpyrifos based on the guidelines of various regulatory entities. <p>In CHLORPYRIFOS RESIDUES IN WATER RESOURCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistencies occur when it is stated that some values are below or above those established by WHO or EPA's, as an example: “ranging from 0.01 to 0.05 µg/L, which were below the WHO guidelines but exceeded the EPA's MCL for drinking water” and “levels ranging from 0.01 to 0.08 µg/L, which were below both the WHO guidelines and the EPA's MCL for drinking water” <p>There is a dot that should not be: “individual pesticides of 0.1 µg/L.”</p> <p>There is a “l” that should not be: “below detection limit to l0.27 µg/L”</p> <p>In RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You should summarize the results with tables or graphs that group the results based on geographic location, for example, by continent. And then discuss about these generated graph or tables. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, language is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	In CHLORPYRIFOS RESIDUES IN WATER RESOURCES: - You should use the values proposed by a single regulator to compare published results, to facilitate comparison	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bernardo A. Leal Carrasco
Department, University & Country	UNEXPO, Venezuela