

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This study's Impact of Aqueduct on Environment and Countermeasures. After reviewing the manuscript, I feel it resembles a technical report more than a scientific study. Each section lacks in-depth explanations and only briefly describes the experimental results. . The manuscript has several important issues that need to be addressed; therefore, I regret to say the manuscript cannot be published in its current status! My recommendation is to reject the manuscript! To improve the quality of the paper, the authors are encouraged to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript contains spelling, formatting, and scientific errors. The manuscript needs to be rewritten as all paragraphs contain errors.</li> <li>2. Poor literature review since it doesn't discuss enough previous studies. The authors should include relevant background information on the manuscript aims.</li> <li>3. The references contain many errors within the manuscript sections and also in the list of references</li> <li>4. Some parts of the conclusions are repetitions of the discussion of the results, and it is suggested that the authors condense the conclusions and make an outlook</li> </ol>	

**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:	Rania Ihsan Ihsan Ali Al-Nawasir
Department, University & Country	University of Al-Qadisiyah, Iraq