

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_88002
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Pesticide Residue Levels in Tomatoes from Open Fields, Greenhouses, Markets and Consumers in Kirinyaga County, 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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should also add another sub-section at the Methodology section regarding the Statistical Analysis. Several grammatical and redactional errors are identified and highlighted in the manuscript. The researchers measured 4 kinds of pesticide levels. Perhaps it should be emphasized more on the reason to measure those four kinds of pesticide levels. Is it because it is the only pesticide available or because it is the most prevalent kinds to be used in tomato cultivation? Or other reasons? Are the tomato samples taken, coming from the same or different varieties? It should also be stated in the methodology section. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To make it more detailed and discussed more thoroughly, perhaps the author(s) should briefly mention the effect of EACH kind of pesticide measured in this manuscript, namely: alpha-cypermethrin, carbendazim, difenoconazole and imidacloprid. In the manuscript, the reviewer identified only carbendazim is being discussed, but the other pesticides also. Considering the importance and urgency of this research, the author could also state in the CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION section on what other aspects could be further studied and investigated. 	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stormy Vertygo
Department, University & Country	State Agricultural Polytechnic of Kupang, Indonesia