

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_123637
Title of the Manuscript:	A Survey-Based Analysis of the Usage Experience of Aluminium Metal Vessels in Our Lives for Risk Assessment Among Kadapa City, Andhra Pradesh, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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 addresses the critical issue of aluminium exposure through the use of aluminium vessels in daily life, particularly in the Indian population. The research highlights the significant health risks, such as renal failure, Alzheimer's, and cancer, associated with aluminium exposure. Its value to the scientific community lies in its survey-based analysis, revealing a direct link between education, occupation, and the extent of aluminium usage. I appreciate this manuscript because it emphasizes public awareness and alternative methods to reduce aluminium toxicity, which could prompt further studies and policy changes. However, more comprehensive data across different regions could enhance its global relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "A Survey-Based Analysis of the Usage Experience of aluminium Metal Vessels in Our Lives for Risk Assessment Among Kadapa City, Andhra Pradesh, India", is informative but lengthy and therefore, it could be more concised. Suggestions for an Alternative Title: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Survey-Based Analysis of Aluminium Vessel Usage and Associated Health Risks in Kadapa City, India"• "Aluminium Vessel Usage and Health Risks: A Survey in Kadapa City, India"• "Health Risks of Aluminium Vessel Use: A Survey from Kadapa City, Andhra Pradesh"	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The article's abstract provides a clear and concise overview of the study, including the health risks posed by aluminium exposure, the methodology used (survey-based analysis), and key findings related to the correlation between aluminium usage and educational/occupational factors. However, it could be enhanced with a few improvements:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explicit mention of key findings: The abstract mentions that aluminium vessel use is prominent, but it would be helpful to mention specific findings from the study, such as the percentage of respondents affected by aluminium toxicity or those unaware of the risks.• Clarify the sample size and demographics: Briefly mention the sample size (500 participants) and the respondents' demographic details to give readers an idea of the population studied.• Expand on the implications: The abstract could benefit from a statement about the broader implications of the study's findings, particularly how it could influence public health policies or future research on reducing aluminium exposure.• Recommendations: The abstract could include a brief mention of recommended alternatives to aluminium vessels, as the conclusion emphasizes exploring safer options.	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections and structure appear generally appropriate and well-organized. It follows a standard scientific format with sections like Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, which ensures clarity and ease of navigation for readers. Each section addresses key aspects of the study, such as the rationale, methodology, and findings.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear delineation of sections: The manuscript flows logically, from explaining the background and motivation for the study to the data analysis and interpretation.• Detailed methods section: The Methods section is thorough, outlining the study design, sampling method, and questionnaire used, which enhances transparency.• Results presented with visuals: Graphical representations of the data help to visualize the study's findings and improve understanding. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion section: It could benefit from further integration of findings with broader literature. Currently, it focuses on the immediate results but could expand more on the implications or comparisons with similar studies. Additionally, the findings of the study have not been correlated with the findings of the previous authors. The authors are suggested to compare each result with the findings of the previous works in a detailed manner highlighting the similarities and dissimilarities of the present work.• Conclusion: A more distinct Conclusion section summarizing the key takeaways and recommendations could help to solidify the manuscript's impact.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound due to its clear research design, which is based on a well-structured survey methodology targeting a specific population in Kadapa City, Andhra Pradesh. The correlation analysis between aluminium vessel usage and factors such as education and occupation is well-justified, adding depth to the findings. Additionally, the study aligns with established health risks of aluminium exposure, supported by references from reputable sources like the World Health Organization and European Food Safety Authority, enhancing its scientific credibility. The detailed data analysis and comprehensive questionnaire further strengthen the technical soundness of the study, making the conclusions both reliable and relevant to public health discussions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Yes, the references used in the manuscript are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Incomplete References: Some references lack complete information, such as journal names, title of the paper, volume numbers, or page ranges. Adhering to a consistent citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago) is essential for scholarly rigor.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?

The language and English quality of the manuscript exhibit a foundational structure suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are several areas where improvements are necessary to enhance the clarity, coherence, and professionalism expected in academic publications. Below is a detailed assessment:

Strengths:

1. **Structured Format:** The manuscript follows a conventional scientific structure with clear sections such as **Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion**, which facilitates readability.
2. **Technical Terminology:** Appropriate use of scientific terms related to aluminium toxicity and its implications indicates a good grasp of the subject matter.
3. **Detailed Content:** The inclusion of comprehensive data, such as demographic profiles and statistical findings, aligns with scholarly expectations for thoroughness.

Areas for Improvement:

1. **Grammar and Syntax:**
 - **Subject-Verb Agreement:** Ensure consistency in subject-verb pairs. For example, "the aluminium industry is pulling with the majority of current and projected growth coming from newly extracted aluminium metal" could be revised for clarity.
 - The sentence written in the **result section 3.10** lacks clarity.
 - **Article Usage:** Proper use of articles ("a," "an," "the") is inconsistent. For instance, "The aluminium industry is pulling with the majority of current and projected growth" should be "The aluminium industry is progressing, with the majority of current and projected growth..."
2. **Consistency in Terminology:**
 - **Spelling Variations:** The manuscript alternates between "Aluminum" and "aluminium." It is crucial to maintain consistency based on the targeted reader's regional preferences.
3. **Clarity and Conciseness:**
 - **Redundancy:** Some sentences are verbose and can be streamlined. For example, "The present study is an effort to see the extent of aluminium metal involvement in our day-to-day lives and identify the possible factors responsible for the human body by using survey-based analysis" can be simplified to "This study assesses the extent of aluminium exposure in daily life and identifies contributing factors through a survey-

Review Form 3

	<p>based analysis."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ambiguous Phrasing: Phrases like "cock food for fast" are unclear and likely contain typographical errors. It's essential to ensure that all statements are precise and unambiguous. <p>4. Punctuation and Formatting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Inconsistent Use of Commas and Periods: Proper punctuation aids in the readability of complex sentences. For instance, "Aluminium has little prospect of a quick return to the lithospheric cycle, and biota is now subject to an ever-increasing burden of potentially biologically available aluminium" should maintain consistent punctuation for better flow.○ Capitalization Errors: Ensure that only appropriate nouns and proper nouns are capitalized. For example, "Renal failure" does not require capitalization unless it begins a sentence. <p>5. Academic Tone and Formality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Informal Phrasing: Phrases like "people are using and are storing" can be replaced with more formal alternatives such as "individuals utilize and store."○ Passive vs. Active Voice: While scientific writing often employs the passive voice, balancing it with the active voice can enhance readability. For example, "A survey-based analysis was conducted" (passive) vs. "We conducted a survey-based analysis" (active). <p>6. Logical Flow and Cohesion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Transition between Sections: Ensure smooth transitions between paragraphs and sections to maintain a logical progression of ideas. For instance, moving from discussing aluminium's properties directly to its health impacts should be seamlessly connected. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Professional Proofreading: Authors are advised to utilize advanced grammar-checking tools to identify and rectify grammatical, syntactical, and typographical errors.2. Consistency Checks: Authors are advised to ensure uniformity in terminology, spelling, and formatting throughout the manuscript.3. Enhanced Clarity: Revision of the complex and ambiguous sentences are suggested to improve clarity so as to ensure that all statements accurately convey the intended meaning.	
--	--	--

Review Form 3

	<p>4. Adherence to Style Guides: Follow a specific academic style guide (such as APA, MLA, or Chicago) consistently for citations, references, and overall manuscript formatting.</p> <p>5. Peer Review: Prior to submission, authors are advised to review the manuscript critically.</p> <p>Example Revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Original: "The aluminium industry is pulling with the majority of current and projected growth coming from newly extracted aluminium metal, nonrecycled aluminium, as might be commonly perceived, and has the potential to enter and accumulate within the biotic cycle."• Suggested: "The Aluminium industry is advancing, with most current and projected growth driven by newly extracted, non-recycled aluminium. This trend increases the potential for aluminium to enter and accumulate within the biotic cycle."• Original: "Aluminium is a versatile metal with several properties and has a wide range of uses."• Suggested: "Aluminium is a versatile metal with multiple properties, making it suitable for a wide range of applications."	
--	--	--

Review Form 3

<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>: Major Revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Expand the Literature Review:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Introduction section briefly touches on the background, but it would benefit from a more in-depth review of previous studies on aluminium toxicity and exposure. Discussing how this study fills gaps in the existing literature or compares to previous research can strengthen the rationale.○ The authors are suggested to include more recent studies on aluminium exposure, toxicity, and its impact on public health to contextualize the findings better.2. Clarify Data Analysis:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The manuscript should include a more detailed statistical analysis in the Results section. While graphs are used effectively, providing specific p-values or confidence intervals for the correlations between aluminium usage and demographic factors (e.g., occupation, education) would enhance the scientific rigor of the study.○ Consider using more advanced statistical methods or tests to validate the findings further, especially when discussing relationships between variables.3. Discussion Section Enhancement:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Discussion section should engage more with the study's findings concerning other research. How do these findings differ or align with global trends? Discuss the limitations of the study, such as sample size or the focus on one specific city, and suggest directions for future research.○ Broader implications should be emphasized. For example, how might this study inform public health initiatives or policy changes beyond Kadapa City?4. Strengthen Conclusion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The conclusion is currently limited. It should be more explicit about the practical recommendations, such as advocating for public awareness campaigns, the potential for government regulations on aluminium usage, and alternative solutions (e.g., using non-aluminium cookware).○ Authors are suggested to summarize key findings in a more impactful way to leave a strong impression on readers. <p>Minor Revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarify Terminology:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Throughout the manuscript, some terms (e.g., "leaching," "toxicity") are used without full explanation. A brief explanation or context for non-specialist readers could make the paper more accessible.2. Improve Figures and Tables:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The graphical representations in the Results section are useful, but some figures (e.g.,	
---	---	--

Review Form 3

	<p>Fig. 2 and Fig. 4) could be made clearer with better labeling or more detailed legends to explain the data visually.</p> <p>3. Standardize Referencing Style:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ensure that references follow a consistent format. Some references appear incomplete or lack necessary details (e.g., journal name, volume number). Also, consider adding DOIs for easier access to the cited literature. <p>4. Proofreading for Grammar and Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There are some major grammatical errors and awkward phrasings throughout the text. A thorough proofreading would help improve the readability and professionalism of the manuscript.	
--	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Poonam Singh
Department, University & Country	Banaras Hindu University, India