Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology**
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.	The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic concerning the development of a spectrophotometric method for the detection of ethylene bis-dithiocarbamate (EBDC) pesticide residues in vegetables. The study is methodologically sound, with clear objectives, detailed experimental design, and robust validation results. However, the manuscript requires revisions to improve clarity, address minor inconsistencies, and enhance the discussion of results. **Strengths:** 1. The objective is well-defined and relevant to current food safety concerns. 2. The methodology is comprehensively described, enabling reproducibility. 3. Validation parameters (LOD, LOQ, precision, recovery) are thoroughly addressed and meet standard guidelines. 4. The results are presented in an organized manner with appropriate use of tables and figures. **Weaknesses:** 1. The introduction contains repetitive information that could be streamlined. 2. Some sentences lack clarity and require grammatical corrections. 3. The discussion section needs improvement to better contextualize findings with existing literature. 4. The conclusion could briefly address potential real-world applications of the proposed method.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is clear and descriptive, but consider simplifying for better readability.	
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.	• Clarify the detection and quantification limits in a more concise manner. • Highlight the novelty of the chromogenic reagent more explicitly.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	• Verify the consistency of reference formatting. • Ensure all citations in the text match the reference list.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Tejaswi Boyapati**
Department, University & Country	**South Dakota State University, USA**