

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_129288
Title of the Manuscript:	New chromogenic reagent for spectrophotometric determination of ethylene bis-dithiocarbamate pesticides in vegetables
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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because EBDCs pesticide residues in vegetables can have detrimental effects on human health, especially when consumed over the time. By using new chromogenic reagent EBDCs quantify in vegetables by simple, convenient than other methods. The developed spectrophotometric method for determination of EBDCs in vegetables was satisfactory with LOD.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive. All points were explained clearly	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. Statistical data well controlled and vigorous. tables and figures are given correctly and adequately.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant but some current references should be added.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the article is quite simple, correct and unambiguous which is easily understandable to the reader.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This method is quit useful and simple. Tables and figures are sufficient. Just list of references need to updates Reference No. 3 and 4 not properly arranged. Reference No. 7. Year 2010 repeated. Reference No. 18 please mention clearly 9 pages here.	

#### 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:	Madhurani Shukla
Department, University & Country	Shri Kuleshwar Mahadev Govt. College, India