

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127338
Title of the Manuscript:	The Aral Sea catastrophe - the price for disturbing the balance
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.	The manuscript is scholarly given the choice of the topic and environmental implications owing to the facts that the Aral sea, located in Central Asia covers a total area of about 1,300,000Km ² consisting of many geographical places. Studies have shown that the Sea, today it is a shadow of its old self, for it has drastically declined in water levels. This catastrophe, caused by human interference, has had a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment and the communities that rely on the Aral Sea for sustenance. The disruption of the balance, due to the diversion of water for irrigation purposes, has led to severe consequences such as changes in climate, loss of biodiversity, and economic struggles for local populations as spelt by the author/s.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is concise and therefore suitable.	
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 is comprehensive enough. It captured virtually the whole study. However, the reviewer noticed that there are 295 words which seems to be above the usually 250 (though not rigid) words for abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are okay	
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 manuscript is rich and scientifically okay for the study has been able to trace the history of the Aral Sea and pointed out the interferences of humans with natural environment and its consequences. Thus: stating the cause for disturbing the balance of natural ecosystems that resulted to ecological disaster of devastating consequences for the surrounding environment, including the loss of biodiversity, increased salinity, and health problems for local populations. Furthermore, the study captured mitigation measures by highlighting the importance of maintaining a balance in nature, and the urgency for sustainable measures to prevent similar disasters in the future through phytoremediation process. These made the study scientific, robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient but based on the Reviewers categorizations of recent references date 2019 – 2024, placed the recent status at 31%.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is very suitable	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simon Stephen Mshelia
Department, University & Country	Federal University Gashua, Nigeria