

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Chemical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_124035
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of the QuECHERS method for the determination of PAHs in surface sediments along the Dakar coast
Type of the 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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The content is well-organized, providing a logical progression from the problem (wastewater pollution) to the method (GC-MS analysis) and results (PAH concentrations). The use of terms such as "PAHs," "GC-MS," "QuEChERS," and statistical tests like "Shapiro-Wilk" and "Levene" is appropriate for a scholarly audience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"A study of the effects of PAH content of surface sediments along the Dakar coast by using QuEChERS method"	
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.	Abstract may be consisted by deletion of unnecessary demographic description about the area as the same need to be mentioned in Introduction part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific correctness of this manuscript is robust and technically sound. The methodology employed is rigorous and follows established scientific practices. The conclusions drawn are supported by the data and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Overall, the attention to detail and adherence to scientific standards contribute to the reliability of this manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In each graph, nodes with numerical values should be represented	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amit Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indira Gandhi Institute of Physical Education &amp; Sports Sciences, University of Delhi, India</b>