

Manuscript: **“Phytosanitary Practices And Evaluation Of 17 Pesticides Residues In Tomatoes Fruits Produced In Foubot District Western Highland-Cameroon”**

**Submitted: 07 November 2020**

**Accepted: 11 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dr. Nerlus Gautier Sopkoutie Kengni

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p30

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Luis Angel Medina Juárez,  
Universidad de Sonora/México

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Phytosanitary practices and evaluation of 17 pesticides residues in tomatoes fruits produced in Foubot district Western Highland-Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11136/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Specify the duration of the study</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The spelling of some names is different between the text and the references Some references are cited in the text, but not in the references</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Check all the references mentioned in the document

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 24/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/12/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Phytosanitary practices and evaluation of 17 pesticides residues in tomatoes fruits produced in Fombot district Western Highland-Cameroon</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 136.11.20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title is appropriate for this work and describes well the topic to be discussed	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
The abstract clearly presents the objectives of the article, the methods to determine	

17 residues of pesticides used in tomato fruits in the district of Foubot Western Highland-Cameroon	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
Should improve the wording of the manuscript. Example: This information does not correspond to that shown in Table 3. “Of the three quantified pesticides, all samples were above the MRL for lambda-cyhalothrin, 92.30% for cypermethrin, and 66.66% for acetamiprid (Table 3)”.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
The methodology for sample preparation and analysis of GC-MS, was written correctly.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
It should improve the discussion of results. Compared with more studies in the region and other countries. Example: Tinyami Erick Tandi, et al., 2014. Small-Scale Tomato Cultivators’ Perception on Pesticides Usage and Practices in Buea Cameroon, Scientific Research, 6(21). <a href="https://doi.org/10.4236/health.2014.621333">10.4236/health.2014.621333</a> Hubert Galania Y J et al., 2020. Monitoring and dietary risk assessment of 81 pesticide residues in 11 local agricultural products from, Food Control Vol. 18. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107416">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107416</a>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The results should improve and the conclusions also	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
References should be newer to support the discussion of the Manuscript	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper entitled: **Phytosanitary practices and evaluation of 17 pesticides residues in tomatoes fruits produced in Foubot district Western Highland-Cameroon**, addresses a very important and interesting topic for that country. In addition, there are scientific publications on this subject show high-quality scientific information. Therefore, they should be included in the discussion of results.

