

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3404
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing Compliance to Safety Measures in Pesticide Use among Small-scale Farmers in Miryia Subcounty, Masindi District, Uganda
Type of the Article	Book chapter

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This Book’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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, this study has important contributions in supporting farmer health and improving safety in the agricultural sector by providing evidence-based data and recommendations that can be implemented to address challenges related to compliance with safe pesticide use. there are some things that need to be corrected: - in the abstract section there are some that need to be simplified - there is a research method section that needs to explain the instrument and statistical analysis used - in the results, discussion and conclusion sections, it is necessary to check the suitability with the research objectives. because the research objectives are written in 3 focuses, while the conclusion does not yet describe the objectives.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	the title is well written	
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.	The abstract has been written comprehensively and in detail. The abstract is quite detailed, but some sentences could be made more concise, especially in the results section. For example, the list of demographics could be shortened or only the most relevant details mentioned. Some phrases, such as "compliance to safe measures in the use of pesticides among farmers" could be simplified for readability, perhaps as "compliance with pesticide safety measures."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, and well written	

Review Form 2

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The significance of this study is to understand the Factors Affecting Safety Compliance, reduce Health Risks, Policy guidance for Strengthening SOPs, recommendations for Education and Training Programs: there are contributions for Further Research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	the references are quite adequate, and most of them are up to date.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is generally good, but it would be better if the grammar was checked again.	
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:	M. Yusuf
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Negeri Bali, Indonesia