



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44154
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Processing on the Levels of Pesticides in some Commonly Consumed Meats from Sagamu, South-western Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	Review some comments in manuscript Adjust document to the format of the journal	Document has been greatly formatted to the Journal style before submission as affirmed by some of the reviewers.
Minor REVISION comments	See comments in document	Several minor revisions have been effected in the revised manuscript. The Table numbers have not been revised because we do not deem it fit to merge Table 2 that was fragmented into two. If it is considered closely, it will be realized that the first part of Table 2 has unit of ng/Kg, while the second part has a unit of µg/Kg. This is due to the wide variation in the quantities of these pesticide residues, though present in the same class. Thus, they have been deliberately separated for neatness and ease of reporting. More so, the second portion of Table 2 has been indicated as 'continued' in the Title. The first part of the discussion in which a reference was requested is not deemed fit for referencing simply because the statement is our inductive explanation of observations from the three set of meats being process. Other statements highlighted by the reviewer around the conclusion are seen to be very appropriate as each of them has specific emphasis to make, if closely examined.
Optional/General comments	Check the manuscript	The Abstract recommendation in 'Author's guideline' is maximum of 300 words. However, our abstract has been summarized to 247 words as submitted to minimize verbosity. Thus, revision done currently was just to improve the grammar rather than reducing the word count per se. We believe the abstract is ok this way.



SDI Review Form 1.6

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