

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Geography, Earth Science and Environment: Research Highlights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3981
Title of the Manuscript:	Co-occurrence of Polychlorinated Biphenyls, Cyanotoxins and Trace Elements in Commercial Fish Species from a Freshwater Protected Area (Pertusillo Lake, Southern Italy)
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 paper provides important information about the coexistence of several environmental pollutants (PCBs, trace elements, and cyanotoxins) in fish from a freshwater protected area. Understanding the effects of such contaminations on the environment and human health, particularly in areas where industrial activity occurs, is made easier by its findings. Public health and aquatic ecosystems scientists, policymakers, and conservationists will benefit from this work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the scope and content of the manuscript. No changes are suggested.	
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 summary provides a clear overview of the study. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of more specific data, such as the highest recorded concentrations of microcystins, cylindrospermopsins or trace elements. This would make it even more informative and attractive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. The methodologies employed, including ELISA for cyanotoxins and atomic absorption spectrophotometry for trace elements, are appropriate and well-documented. The results are adequately interpreted, but the authors should emphasize limitations, such as the absence of summer sampling for cyanotoxins.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and mostly recent. To strengthen the discussion on the synergistic effects of contaminants, the authors might consider including more studies on interactions between trace metals and cyanotoxins.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is acceptable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	<p>-The manuscript provides solid data but could improve its impact by discussing potential management or remediation strategies for the identified contaminants.</p> <p>- A graphical summary summarizing the main results could improve accessibility for a wider audience.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and makes an important contribution to the field. Minor improvements in the abstract, discussion of limitations, and language could enhance its overall quality.</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bouhadiba Sultana
Department, University & Country	Higher School of Biological Sciences of Oran, Algeria