

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2569
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of Deposit Materials on Environment Pollution Around Industrial Areas in Kosovo
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a detailed analysis of heavy metal pollution and its ecological risks in key industrial regions of Kosovo, an area that may not be widely studied in existing literature. The integration of both pollution levels and ecological risk assessments offers valuable insights into the environmental impact of industrial activities, contributing to the global understanding of industrial pollution. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive approach, particularly the use of multiple analytical methods to assess contamination. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more structured and concise presentation of its findings to enhance clarity and impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear but could be more specific. Including key aspects such as the type of deposit materials or a mention of heavy metals would make the title more informative. Consider revising the title to reflect the specific pollutants or regions studied, e.g., " Impact of Industrial Deposits on Heavy Metal Pollution and Ecological Risk in Kosovo's Key Industrial Regions."	
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 provides a broad overview of the study but lacks specific details about the methods, results, and conclusions. It introduces key concepts like heavy metals and Persistent Organic Pollutants but does not give a clear summary of the study's findings. The abstract should succinctly summarize the study’s objectives, methodology (including specific analytical techniques), key findings, and implications. For example, include a brief mention of the concentration levels of specific heavy metals found and the areas most affected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript generally follows a logical structure, covering essential elements such as the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. However, there are areas where the structure and subsections could be enhanced for better clarity and flow. The introduction provides a broad overview but could be more focused, benefiting from clearer subsections or paragraphs that separately address the background, objectives, and significance of the study. In the methodology section, while detailed, the information could be better organized into subsections like Sampling, Analytical Techniques, and Data Analysis to ensure all key aspects of the research process are systematically covered. The results and discussion sections are sometimes intertwined, making it challenging to distinguish between the presentation of data and its interpretation. Separating these into distinct sections or using subheadings to differentiate between different pollutants, regions, or analyses would improve readability.	

Review Form2

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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive approach to assessing heavy metal pollution and ecological risk in Kosovo's industrial regions. The use of established analytical methods, such as ICP-OES and SAA, ensures the accuracy and reliability of the data collected.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references appear comprehensive but could be updated with more recent literature. Additionally, the formatting is inconsistent, with some references lacking key details like page numbers or DOI links. Ensure all references are formatted consistently according to a recognized citation style. Include recent studies that support or contrast with your findings to place your research within the current scientific discourse. If possible, provide DOIs for easy access.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript have some areas that need improvement to be suitable for scholarly communication. Some sentences are long and complex, making them difficult to follow. For example, the sentence in the abstract, "Heavy metals unlike organic pollutants are not biodegradable," could be revised to "Unlike organic pollutants, heavy metals are not biodegradable." There are instances where punctuation is missing, such as commas needed to separate clauses. For instance, "Because heavy metals are not biodegradable and remain hazardous for a long time in exposed environments they enter water systems as salts and enter organisms as ions where they initiate enzymatic processes and lead to cell death." Some sentences are fragmented or lack clarity. For example, "Although persistent organic pollutants (POPs) remain in the center of scientific attention due to their low degradation rate lipophilic nature toxicity ability to be transported over long distances and to bioaccumulate. in living organisms." Terms like "pollutants," "contaminants," and "toxic materials" are used interchangeably without clear definition, which can confuse readers. There is some unnecessary repetition of ideas and phrases, which could be streamlined to improve readability. For example, the introduction repeats several points already made in the abstract. The tone is mostly formal, but it occasionally slips into a more casual or overly complex style. Maintaining a consistent formal tone is essential for scholarly communication. There are a few minor spelling mistakes that need correction	
Optional/General comments	The introduction repeats the content found in the abstract without adding much context or depth. It lacks a clear research question or hypothesis and could benefit from a more detailed literature review to establish the study's significance.Enhance the introduction by clearly stating the research question or hypothesis. Provide a brief overview of previous studies in Kosovo or similar regions and clearly define the objectives of the study. Also, ensure that the industrial context of Kosovo is more explicitly tied to the environmental issues discussed. The methodology section is somewhat fragmented. It mentions the collection of samples and the use of ICP-OES and SAA but does not provide sufficient detail on the sampling process, preparation, or analysis.Provide a more detailed methodology, including the rationale for selecting the sampling sites, the procedure for sample collection and preparation, and the specifics of the analytical techniques used (e.g., detection limits, calibration methods). Consider including a flowchart or diagram to visually represent the process. The results are presented with significant data but lack a coherent narrative that ties the findings to the research objectives. The discussion is scattered, often repeating information from the results without offering deep analysis or interpretation.Structure the results and discussion sections to clearly differentiate between what was found (results) and what it means (discussion). Use subheadings to break down the findings by area or metal. In the discussion, compare your findings with those from other studies, explore potential sources of contamination, and discuss the implications for environmental policy and public health. The tables are informative but lack clear explanations or captions that would help a reader understand the data without referring back to the text. Figure 1, which shows sampling locations, is mentioned but not fully utilized in the discussion.Ensure that all tables and figures are accompanied by descriptive captions that explain what is being shown. Make direct references to these tables and figures in the	

Review Form2

	text and use them to support your analysis. Additionally, consider adding graphical representations of the data for easier interpretation. The conclusion section restates the findings but lacks a clear, impactful takeaway or suggestions for future research. To improve it, summarize the key results in line with the study's goals. Emphasize the most important contributions of your work to the field and propose specific areas for future research, like long-term monitoring or strategies to reduce pollution. The manuscript addresses an important issue of environmental pollution in Kosovo, which is valuable. However, the execution could be improved to make the findings more impactful.Focus on making the study's significance clearer throughout the manuscript. Strengthen the methodological rigor, clarify the narrative, and ensure that the manuscript contributes meaningful insights to both local and global environmental studies.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Asif All Azad
Department, University & Country	Khulna University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh