

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_129063
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Aqueduct on Environment and Countermeasures
Type of the Article	Opinion 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 manuscript is vital for the scientific community as it explores the environmental impacts of aqueduct construction and offers practical, sustainable countermeasures. It bridges the gap between engineering practices and ecological preservation, contributing valuable insights to sustainable hydraulic engineering. This work supports policymakers and engineers in balancing infrastructure development with environmental responsibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Impact of Aqueduct on Environment and Countermeasures," is informative but lacks specificity and precision. A more suitable title could be: "Environmental Impacts of Aqueduct Construction and Sustainable Countermeasures." This title emphasizes both the focus on construction impacts and the inclusion of sustainable solutions, making it more precise and appealing to the scientific community.	
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 effectively introduces the topic but would benefit from greater specificity. Including key findings, such as seasonal variations in water quality and specific countermeasures like wastewater treatment and dust control, would enhance its comprehensiveness. With these additions and a clearer focus on the study's significance for sustainable hydraulic engineering, the abstract can better reflect the value of the manuscript.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it discusses environmental impacts such as soil erosion, water contamination, and atmospheric pollution using relevant data and references. The proposed countermeasures, including wastewater treatment and noise control, are consistent with established green construction practices. However, the inclusion of more quantitative data, visual aids like figures and tables, and a clearer explanation of methodologies would strengthen its scientific rigor and credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, covering key aspects of green construction and environmental impacts of aqueducts. However, some references are older, and the inclusion of more recent studies (post-2020) could provide updated insights, especially regarding innovative countermeasures or recent environmental assessments. Additionally, verifying accessibility and proper citation format for some sources, such as reference [11], is recommended. Suggesting specific recent publications or studies in sustainable hydraulic engineering and environmental management would further enhance the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally understandable but requires improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. Some sentences are overly lengthy and lack clarity, and there are instances of grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. For example, phrases like "China's comprehensive development is becoming increasingly comprehensive" should be revised for precision. Refining the manuscript for conciseness, coherence, and grammatical accuracy would enhance its readability and scholarly tone.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript addresses a relevant and critical topic in sustainable infrastructure development and provides valuable insights into the environmental impacts of aqueduct construction. However, to enhance its impact, it would benefit from incorporating more quantitative data, visual aids like figures or tables, and a clearer distinction between general impacts and innovative findings. Additionally, refining the language and ensuring the inclusion of recent references will strengthen the manuscript's academic quality and readability. Overall, the article has strong potential to contribute to the field with these improvements.	

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:	Bright Ojo
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas, USA