

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	<u>Chemical warfare and environmental warfare operations</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BP_3060G.5
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEMICAL WARFARE OPERATIONS
Type of the Article	Complete Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstracts need to be rewritten; no key information is given about the work performed. 2. Many grammatical errors observed all over the article. 3. Introduction section needs more referencing, every statement given need referencing. 4. No references were cited in the article sections. 5. In the introduction section more information about the geographical information are missing. 6. What are the examples of the toxic chemicals, need to address in the introduction setion. 7. Cyanide Ion inhalation via powder form or gas form? 8. Different fornt colours observed all over the article. 9. Nerve agent contains only Amides anf Esters? 10. Figure source of adaptaion need to be addressed. 11. Chemical information is missing. 12. Sample preparation is not clear. 13. Referencing part is not according to the journal requirements. referencing is not consistent. 14. Reference section need to be rewritten. 	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

[Review Form 2](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gunasekar Manoharan
Department, University & Country	New Jersey Bio Science Centre, USA