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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **The manuscript titled Level of Microplastic Contamination in the Ark Shell Arca senelis (Linnaeus 1785) from Baie des Milliardaires (Île Boulay, Ébrié Lagoon System) is an interesting research idea. The research highlighted a very important issue of microplastic pollution in aquatic organisms. The article further highlighted how microplastic can enter the food chain and pose the environment and human health at risk. The authors have put good efforts and prepare a well drafted manuscript. The authors can further enhance the quality of the manuscript by considering the following suggestions and comments.**  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the article is clear and reflect the content of the manuscript** |  |
| 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. | **Is this fragmented abstract is the journal requirement? If not I would suggest to merge all the section and make it into one.**  |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct. However need to imprve especially the language and formatting issues.**  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **Some of the references are very outdated and some are non aunthentic. Please see some of the suggested** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hazadv.2024.100487>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emcon.2023.100233>, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2024.143221 |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The overall language of the manuscript need improvement  |  |
| Optional/General comments | 1. Plastic currently occupies a central place in almost all industrial manufacturing processes. Its global production, estimated at 400 million tons per year, is expected to double by 2040, with 90% of this production coming from fossil hydrocarbons (Nature editorial, 2022). Please check the authencity of these content as in some literature this figure is mentioned as 2050 instead of 2040. Please check and support this with a reliable original source. 2. Plastic and microplastics terms are used inconsistently, the authors are advised to use consistent terminology according to the study requirement. For instance “Among the species of aquatic fauna heavily impacted by plastic pollution are sessile benthic mollusks, considered indicators of surface water pollution (Vidyalakshmi et al., 2024).” Confirm is the study was conducted on plastic or microplastic. 3. The authors have started the introduction part by listing some good literature however they failed to conclude it with a good sequence. The authors are therefore advised to slightly revise the introduction part. Start with the background, identify and highlight the gaps in the existing literature and write a rationale statement providing justification for drafting this manuscript. The authors need to mention the gaps which motivated them to write this manuscript. The conclude it by mentioining the questions which is to be answered by this manuscript. 4. Improve figure 1, if possible made a new GIS map which clearly shows the study area 5. The methodology part has enough content, however the language need to be improved. In addition support all your statement with citations. In case some part has been developed by the authors please provide justification for that. **Figure 4:** Combined spectra of the various polymers identified by FT-IR from the hundred MPs subsamples extracted from the fresh tissue of adult *Arca senelis*. This kind of presentation is not correct the authors are advised to use the correct software to present FTIR data. Need to draw proper figure rather than to paste computer screen. 7. The conclusion is very superfacial the authors are advised to rewrite it. Highlight your key findings, what are the major challenges and then the way forward. 8. Some of the references are outdated, add some recent studies, see if these are of your help http://dx.doi.org/10.20517/wecn.2023.61 |  |
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