

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	<b><u>Chemical warfare and environmental warfare operations</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BP_3060G.6</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development of environmental warfare ammunition by using mining waste, oil and gas waste</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book chapter</b>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	<b>A careful reading of the literature sources from the last few years related to my submitted manuscript show that the author/authors are conducting research in a new scientific direction. The research is important to the scientific community because it involves the use of nuclear, chemical and biological components through natural means (water, air, soil) and not through actual weapons, which are prohibited by existing treaties.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The information presented in this chapter indicates that consideration is being given to the possible use of mine tailings, oil and gas tailings as feedstocks for the development of environmental warfare agents. This gives me the right to confirm that the title matches the material presented in the book.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>I believe that the summary has been developed sufficiently fully. In my opinion, its content could be improved, with directions for the possible raw material use of combat environmental agents being specified by the author(s) more clearly in this paragraph sequence: 1. Designing munitions to combat the environment using arsenic, cyanide, fluorite, mercury and hydrogen sulfide, and other heavy and deadly elements. 2. The use of solid waste, waste water, waste gases from oil fields and liquids from mines and oil gas deposits. 3. Use of depleted uranium. 4. Use of oil and gas production, their waste, debris, soil contaminated with lubricating oils from drilling, contamination of natural gas with hydrogen sulfide, etc. 5. Use of Hg compounds and cyanides in gold production.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>Yes, I consider the manuscript is scientifically correct. My main argument is that this is a new field of science that is yet to develop.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>15 References were cited in the writing of this chapter. However, I noticed that references numbered 9,10,11,13 and 14,15 were used. It would be correct to indicate certain places in the paragraphs for the other references.</b>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I confirm that the linguistic quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication. My argument for this statement that regardless of the specific terminology, the manuscript reads smoothly.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My overall impression of the manuscript is positive. The author(s) have researched a sufficient number of literature sources. The article is written in readable English regardless of the specific terminology of the given scientific field. The minor corrections suggested do not detract from the merits of this interesting study. I believe that the editorial team will provide the necessary advice to the author to improve the appearance of the text in the book.  The minor Revision is related to my suggestion to improve the paragraphing in the Introduction, and also to the citations, because 6 citations are given and there are 15 in the reference list	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	Mihail Haralampiev
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	Vasil Levski National University, Bulgaria