

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_127650
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metals in Atmospheric Dust Deposition in Qalyubia governorate Egypt: Occurrence and Diverse Impacts
Type of the Article	

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research is important to the scientific community due to the danger of the presence of heavy metals in the air of cities and villages.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES, but old.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- Do not mention symbols in the abstract. 2- No references are included in the research objectives. 3- In Figure 1, the researcher did not mention the reference from which he took it. 4- The title of Table 3 is placed at the top and there are no units of measurement in the table. 5- It is not permissible to put a figure 3 for the same data mentioned in table 3, so this figure is deleted because it is a duplication of the results. 6- The last figure was not mentioned in the text of the research. 7- The researcher did not mention statistically significant differences between the sample collection sites, and this is incorrect. 8- There is no explanation for the results, which must be based on scientific references, so they are rewritten again. 9- Reference 3 has no publication year. 10- There is no uniformity in writing the year of publication in the references mentioned in the list of references.	

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:	Ihsan Flayyih Hasan AL-Jawhari
Department, University & Country	Iraq