

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129043
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging Threat from Arsenic in Anthropocene Epoch, West Bengal, India.
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 article explores a critical public health and environmental issue, arsenic contamination in West Bengal and provides valuable insights into its causes, effects, and potential solutions. Arsenic contamination, aggravated by anthropogenic stress in the Ganga basin, affects groundwater in 221 districts across states like Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, and West Bengal. Arsenic levels often exceed WHO limits, with West Bengal bore wells showing contamination at 14–132m depth. Long-term exposure leads to severe health risks, especially during pregnancy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable but I recommend this title "Arsenic Contamination in West Bengal: A Growing Challenge in the Anthropocene Epoch"	
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 right but need to improve by using clear and precise scientific language, replacing vague terms like "vivacity of arsenic-invasive human health." Address the limitations of data availability by discussing its impact and proposing solutions, such as using broader datasets. Provide more detail on geogenic mechanisms, such as redox reactions and organic matter's role in arsenic mobilization, and clarify temporal trends to focus on recent anthropogenic influences. Substantiate claims, such as "lift water is the primary contamination source," with evidence or context.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This article is significantly correct and effectively identified the historical and current state of arsenic contamination in West Bengal, offering a regional perspective on a global issue.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	These references are enough but the old references should be deleted and updated	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are few grammatical mistake and errors in sentences that should be corrected	
Optional/General comments	Based on the above comments the MS should be rechecked before being submitted to the journal.	

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:	Saddam Hussain
Department, University & Country	São Carlos Institute of Chemistry, University of São Paulo, Brazil