

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Geography, Earth Science and Environment: Research Highlights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4035
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmaceutical Pollution in Aquatic Environments: Environmental Impact and Bioremediation Technologies as a Solution
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 manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical environmental issue—pharmaceutical pollution in aquatic ecosystems—and explores sustainable bioremediation strategies to mitigate its impact. By providing a comprehensive analysis of the sources, ecological consequences, and innovative solutions, the manuscript bridges existing knowledge gaps and highlights the urgent need for action. Its focus on bioremediation technologies, including microbial and enzymatic approaches, aligns with global efforts to develop eco-friendly remediation techniques. Furthermore, this work can serve as a valuable reference for researchers, policymakers, and environmental managers striving to combat pharmaceutical pollution and promote sustainable environmental practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The current title, "Pharmaceutical Pollution in Aquatic Environments: Environmental Impact and Bioremediation Technologies as a Solution," is clear and descriptive. It effectively conveys the manuscript's focus on pharmaceutical pollution, its environmental impact, and potential bioremediation solutions. However, it could be made more concise and engaging by refining it.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title: "Pharmaceutical Pollution in Aquatic Ecosystems: Impacts and Bioremediation Strategies"</p> <p>This revision maintains clarity while being more succinct and focusing on the manuscript's core themes.</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the manuscript, addressing the key aspects of pharmaceutical pollution, its environmental impacts, and the potential of bioremediation technologies as solutions. However, it could be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight the specific benefits of bioremediation: The abstract mentions bioremediation but does not emphasize its advantages over conventional treatment methods. Adding a brief statement about its eco-friendliness and cost-effectiveness would strengthen the abstract. Key findings or outcomes: Briefly mention the main conclusions or results, such as the identified effectiveness of specific bioremediation techniques like mycoremediation. Scope of study: Indicate the geographical or methodological scope of the review to give readers a clearer idea of the manuscript's breadth. <p>Suggested Deletions or Refinements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Repetition of general points: Phrases like “pharmaceutical pollution is a global concern” could be streamlined to avoid redundancy. Ambiguity in phrasing: Phrases like “biomedical remedies” are vague. Replacing them with “bioremediation strategies” or similar terminology would make the abstract clearer. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, addressing pharmaceutical pollution, its environmental impacts, and bioremediation technologies accurately. However, verifying claims, consistency in terminology, and ensuring up-to-date references will strengthen its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relevant, covering key studies on pharmaceutical pollution and bioremediation techniques. Most of the references are recent, with several from the past 3–5 years, indicating that the manuscript is based on contemporary research. However, some references, such as [12] (Bonaventura & Johnson, 1997), may be outdated for this rapidly evolving field and could be replaced or supplemented with more recent studies.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and concise explanations of complex concepts. However, some sentences are overly long, and minor grammatical issues, word repetition, and inconsistent phrasing reduce overall readability. For example, phrases like “pharmaceutical pollutions in an aquatic ecosystem have been emerging as a global concern” could be refined for grammatical accuracy and conciseness.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sajid Abdullah</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Agriculture, Pakistan</p>