
PLOS ONE: A decision has been made on PONE-D-22-01632 - [EMID:fddc48cae9e8f275]

PLOS ONE <em@editorialmanager.com>
Balas Ke: PLOS ONE <plosone@plos.org>
Kepada: Akas Yekti Pulih Asih <akasyekti@unusa.ac.id>

20 April 2022 01.09

PONE-D-22-01632

Are Green Household Consumer Products Less Toxic than Conventional Products? A Comparative Assessment Involving Grass Shrimp (*Palaemon pugio*) and *Daphnia magna*
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. Yekti Pulih Asih,

Thank you for your review of this manuscript. The Editor has decided not to publish this paper.

A copy of the decision letter can be found below.

You can also access your review comments and the decision letter by logging onto Editorial Manager as a Reviewer.

Kind regards,
Lea Razielle Palmero
Support Staff - Editorial
PLOS ONE

To: *****
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: PLOS ONE Decision: PONE-D-22-01632

PONE-D-22-01632

Are Green Household Consumer Products Less Toxic than Conventional Products? A Comparative Assessment Involving Grass Shrimp (*Palaemon pugio*) and *Daphnia magna*
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. *****,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PLOS ONE. After careful consideration, we have decided that your manuscript does not meet our criteria for publication and must therefore be rejected.

I am sorry that we cannot be more positive on this occasion, but hope that you appreciate the reasons for this decision.

Kind regards,

Achmad Syafiuddin, Ph.D.
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

[Note: HTML markup is below. Please do not edit.]

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Comments to the Author

1. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Partly

2. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

3. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

The [PLOS Data policy](#) requires authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be provided as part of the manuscript or its supporting information, or deposited to a public repository. For example, in addition to summary statistics, the data points behind means, medians and variance measures should be available. If there are restrictions on publicly sharing data—e.g. participant privacy or use of data from a third party—those must be specified.

Reviewer #1: No

Reviewer #2: Yes

4. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

5. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

Reviewer #1: The actual writing is in accordance with the understanding of the need to return to nature by carrying out a green revolution, but the use of bioindicators at the bottom of the water is very unfounded) considering that household waste is relatively small compared to industrial waste. Many household wastes consist of organic matter and will immediately decompose when disposed of on the ground, into the waters and even into the air.

In the world industrial waste greatly affects life, it is most likely that the poisoning in bioindicators (shrimp, shell, small fish etc) is not caused by organic household waste but by industrial waste (it will be very difficult to distinguish the effects)

Reviewer #2: After careful evaluation, I am sorry to inform you that your manuscript cannot be further consideration for publication in this journal. The work appears to have been carried out with care, but unfortunately we are unable to accept all of the sound work submitted to us. Some factors entering into this decision include depth of the work, novelty, language, and adherence to journal guidelines (e.g., highlights, manuscript structure, and references).

6. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article ([what does this mean?](#)). If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose “no”, your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review? For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Reviewer #1: **Yes:** Akas Yekti Pulih Asih

Reviewer #2: No

[NOTE: If reviewer comments were submitted as an attachment file, they will be attached to this email and accessible via the submission site. Please log into your account, locate the manuscript record, and check for the action link "View Attachments". If this link does not appear, there are no attachment files.]

For journal use only: PONEDEC3

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Source details

PLoS ONE

Open Access ⓘ

Scopus coverage years: from 2006 to Present

Publisher: Public Library of Science

ISSN: 1932-6203

Subject area: Multidisciplinary

Source type: Journal

CiteScore 2021

5.6 ⓘ

SJR 2021

0.852 ⓘ

SNIP 2021

1.368 ⓘ

[View all documents >](#)

[Set document alert](#)

[Save to source list](#) [Source Homepage](#)

[CiteScore](#) [CiteScore rank & trend](#) [Scopus content coverage](#)

i Improved CiteScore methodology

CiteScore 2021 counts the citations received in 2018-2021 to articles, reviews, conference papers, book chapters and data papers published in 2018-2021, and divides this by the number of publications published in 2018-2021. [Learn more >](#)

CiteScore 2021 ▼

$$5.6 = \frac{365,216 \text{ Citations 2018 - 2021}}{65,549 \text{ Documents 2018 - 2021}}$$

Calculated on 05 May, 2022

CiteScoreTracker 2022 ⓘ

$$5.4 = \frac{330,000 \text{ Citations to date}}{60,601 \text{ Documents to date}}$$

Last updated on 05 November, 2022 • Updated monthly

CiteScore rank 2021 ⓘ

Category	Rank	Percentile
Multidisciplinary	#15/120	87th

[View CiteScore methodology >](#) [CiteScore FAQ >](#) [Add CiteScore to your site ↗](#)

About Scopus

[What is Scopus](#)

[Content coverage](#)

[Scopus blog](#)

[Scopus API](#)

[Privacy matters](#)

Language

[日本語版を表示する](#)

[查看简体中文版本](#)

[查看繁體中文版本](#)

[查看简体中文看 版本看体](#) [看 体体 简中](#) [本](#)

Customer Service

[Help](#)

[Tutorials](#)

[Contact us](#)

ELSEVIER

[Terms and conditions](#) ↗ [Privacy policy](#) ↗

Copyright © Elsevier B.V. ↗ . All rights reserved. Scopus® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

We use cookies to help provide and enhance our service and tailor content. By continuing, you agree to the use of cookies ↗.

