

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_124169
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Light Pollution and Its Effects on Human Health and the Environment: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The work is of great significance to the scientific community because it fills important gaps in the literature by providing insightful information on the research issue. As a result of its well-organized argument and solid data analysis, it is a solid contender to further knowledge in the relevant sector. To improve the discussion of consequences, there might be space for more detail in certain areas. It would be beneficial to highlight the importance or urgency of the research problem by including figures or studies from more recent times. Stress the ways in which this publication closes certain gaps in earlier research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is quite suitable according to the theme of the article.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript's abstract is quite thorough, yet there are a few places where minor adjustments might greatly increase impact and clarity. A brief indication of the particular research gap that this study aims to fill could be included in the abstract. An additional sentence outlining the topics that past research hasn't addressed in enough detail would strengthen the case for the study. The abstract talks about how light pollution affects the environment and human health, but it doesn't go into detail about the methodology or how the information was gathered and the conclusions were combined.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, they are appropriate. However, more descriptive titles in some cases like the Circadian Rhythms, Breeding and Migration would have helped the paper much. Illustrative data could have been incorporated in some subsections in the form of tables for more clarity.	
<b>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.</b>	The article demonstrates scientific robustness. The arguments rest upon well established research and peer reviewed sources. The paper is supported by logical flow of evidence and maintains a balanced perspective. It will be helpful for future studies.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	The references are comprehensive but inclusion of more recent studies would have been beneficial for the paper. Several new studies have shared thoughts on the topic of discussion. Kyba et al. (2023): Analysis of the global increase in terrestrial light pollution. Link: <a href="#">American Astronomical Society - Rapid Brightening of Night Skies</a> Artificial Light at Night Report (2023): Dark Sky International, Link: <a href="#">DarkSky International - Artificial Light at Night: State of the Science 2023</a> Münzel et al. (2021): Study on the impact of nighttime light pollution on cardiovascular health. Link: <a href="#">GeroScience - The Dark Side of Nocturnal Light Pollution</a>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is adequate for scholarly communication and interpretation.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Although the overall methodology is sound, there is minimal discussion on why certain methods were chosen over others. This could raise questions about the validity and replicability of the conclusions drawn.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arunima Bhattacharya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vidyasagar College for Women, India</b>