

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79379
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Public Awareness Ensuring the Sustainability of Arsenic Mitigation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I have reviewed the manuscript and it was interesting. I want to congratulate the authors for the review that addresses the issue of enormous social significance for certain regions and population groups. Studies of the contamination of soil and groundwater with heavy metals and toxic microelements have always been the actual, both 50 years ago and in the modern age. Research on the impact of this problem on the health of the population is also urgent today in the context of a pandemic and the growth of non-communicable chronic diseases.</p> <p>I am overwhelmed by the catastrophic consequences of arsenic poisoning for the population described in the review. However, unfortunately, I cannot recommend the article for publication in its present state.</p> <p>Arsenic is usually naturally present at high levels in the groundwater therefore, I do not see any connection with pharmacology here, but I see an important social significance of this review. I would consider redirecting the article to another journal that specializes in public health issues. If the authors discuss arsenic contamination of groundwater and soil from pharmacological production or other processes, this should be indicated in the manuscript.</p> <p>I ask the authors to pay attention that this is a review or an original article and not an original research article. Even a very good review is not original research in the context that is usually used as a section in a journal.</p> <p>I have a few more comments and you will see these comments below. I recommend the article for publication only after taking these comments into account.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I recommend the authors use generally accepted academic terms and avoid using words such as 'nightmare', 'tragic', and others when describing the subject of research. It seems to me that more facts and less emotion are needed to disclose the toxic arsenic problem. For example, like this, "In a highly affected area of Bangladesh, 21.4% of all deaths in the area were attributed to arsenic levels above 10 µg/L in drinking-water". 2. What is the 'In many cases'? 20%, 50%, 80%? 3. It is not enough to place the figures in the text. It is necessary to specify to which paragraph the figure belongs. 4. The authors wrote : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> P.4. "...For example, higher education increased the level of understanding and appeared to act as a catalytic agent to accept innovations [47]..." P.4. "...A questionnaire based survey in the affected area of Cambodia revealed that like other countries knowledge of the problem does not appeared to be gendered, but wealth and education level do impact upon knowledge [49]. People's education, age, or gender has no effect on knowledge of an arsenic problem in the household [27]. In many cases the improvement in awareness for people with low education and low income is even higher than for people with higher education and higher income, perhaps because better educated respondents start with more knowledge [50]..." P.6. "...Better-educated people are found to be more likely to understand the mechanisms of arsenic poisoning..." <p>Does the level of education/gender influence the knowledge of the problem of arsenic or not? If this is</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>a controversial issue, then you need to point it out.</p> <p>5. The authors wrote : P.5. "...Poor people are found to be significantly less likely than others to consider taking a piped supply connection, presumably because they do not want to pay water bills [41]..." Maybe they "cannot" instead "do not want"?</p> <p>6. The authors wrote : P. 5. "...However, long term social impacts and adverse situational behavior make them to mental disable..." I ask the authors to pay attention to the fact that arsenic poisoning often leads specifically to both mental disabilities and mental disorders, and negative social impact causes mental disorders such as anxiety and depression. Of course, mental disability can be produced by mental disorders, but it also depends on other factors. These are different terms.</p> <p>7. Though the information in the chapters "Belief & Practices", "Social Consequences of Arsenic Hazards", "Socioeconomic problems", "People's Risk Perception", "Ostracism", "Gender Discrimination" is essential to understanding the problem, it repeated and needs optimization. For example, the authors wrote: P. 5. "...In some cases, social ostracism and superstitious problem is found to be catastrophically insisting among the communities. While it is one of the main causes that is directly inhibit their normal life style and daily working activities. However, long term social impacts and adverse situational behavior make them to mental disable. In the long term way to life leading, it may appear as a social disaster for the greater context of arsenic hazards [56]..." P.6. "...In some cases, social ostracism and superstitious problem is found to be catastrophically insisting among the communities. There is an increasing tendency to avoid arsenicosis patients even within families—they are indirectly neglected and isolated [55]. However, long term social impacts and adverse situational behavior make them to mental disable. In the long term way to life leading, it may appear as a social disaster for the greater context of arsenic hazards [56]." Everything in P.5. paragraph is repeated in the following P.6. paragraph. As a result, this paragraph should be deleted to prevent unnecessary redundancy.</p> <p>Other information is also repeated from section to section. Especially information about ostracism, stigma, discrimination, human rights violation and gender inequality. It is clear that this is important information, but specifics are needed in a scientific article.</p> <p>I encourage the authors to revise the remaining sections in the context of this comment.</p> <p>8. In my opinion, an article can be published in the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International only after describing the peculiarities of arsenic contamination due to pharmacological processes, adding specific data.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Changing legislation is an important step towards solving the problem of arsenic poisoning. Since the review pays a lot of attention to changes in legislation, in my opinion, it would be nice to reflect this in the conclusions. However, if you write about imperfect legislation on some issue, I would recommend including references to documents of existing legislation that need improvement, amendment, etc.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Olena Yelizarova
Department, University & Country	State Institution O.M. Marzиеv Institute for Public Health of the National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine