

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127400
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Health Impact Assessments and Eco-modernity of Sukinda Chromite Ultramafic Belt: India
Type of the Article	Research article based on the survey report

#### General guidelines for the 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 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 feedback here)</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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of environmental degradation and public health impacts in one of the most polluted mining regions globally. By integrating Environmental Health Impact Assessment (EHIA), the study bridges the gap between environmental and health evaluations, offering a holistic approach to sustainable mining practices. The detailed data on pollution and health outcomes, combined with actionable recommendations, provide a valuable resource for policymakers, researchers, and industry stakeholders. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance and comprehensive methodology, but improvements in organization and clarity are necessary to maximize its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Okay , it is fine	
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.	1.The manuscript would benefit from a clearer structure with distinct subsections for each major environmental component (air, water, soil, noise) and their respective impacts. 2.Some sections, such as the "Discussion," combine multiple ideas without clear transitions, leading to repetition and reduced focus. Based on these points abstract needs revision	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Restructure sections for better flow and clarity, ensuring each environmental impact category is discussed separately	
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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of environmental degradation and public health impacts in one of the most polluted mining regions globally. By integrating Environmental Health Impact Assessment (EHIA), the study bridges the gap between environmental and health evaluations, offering a holistic approach to sustainable mining practices. The detailed data on pollution and health outcomes, combined with actionable recommendations, provide a valuable resource for policymakers, researchers, and industry stakeholders. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance and comprehensive methodology, but improvements in organization and clarity are necessary to maximize its impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Okay. But not clearly organized	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>While the manuscript demonstrates significant merit and addresses a critical topic, I recommend accepting it for publication only after <b>major revisions</b>. The following changes are essential:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restructure sections for better flow and clarity, ensuring each environmental impact category is discussed separately.</li> <li>2. Simplify technical language to make the manuscript accessible to a wider audience.</li> <li>3. Provide more in-depth interpretation of the findings, particularly regarding their long-term implications and policy relevance.</li> <li>4. Improve the formatting of figures, tables, and references for consistency and professionalism.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Organization:</b> The manuscript would benefit from a clearer structure with distinct subsections for each major environmental component (air, water, soil, noise) and their respective impacts. Some sections, such as the "Discussion," combine multiple ideas without clear transitions, leading to repetition and reduced focus.</li> <li>2. <b>Clarity and Precision:</b> The language is often technical or ambiguous, which may hinder comprehension for a broader audience. Simplifying phrasing and avoiding vague terms (e.g., "squalor water") will improve readability. Overuse of passive voice diminishes the directness of some findings.</li> <li>3. <b>Data Interpretation:</b> While the manuscript provides extensive data, it lacks adequate interpretation of key findings. For example, the long-term implications of soil alkalinity on agriculture or the socioeconomic consequences of mining-related health risks are underexplored.</li> <li>4. <b>Figures and Tables:</b> Some figures and tables, while detailed, lack captions that fully explain their significance. Clearer labeling and linking them to the text would improve their utility.</li> <li>5. <b>Citations and Formatting:</b> The manuscript includes direct hyperlinks in the text, which is not standard practice. Proper referencing should replace these. Consistency in formatting (e.g., units of measurement, capitalization of terms) is needed.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Venkateswara Rao</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Swarnandhra College of Engineering &amp; Technology, JNTUK, India</b></p>