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|  | 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.** | * Important community-based data on the serious problem of indoor air pollution in rural India is presented in this publication. * This study fills a gap in the literature by providing useful, detailed data on these populations by methodically assessing air quality and linking it to particular exterior and interior housing conditions. * Inadequate ventilation, overcrowding, closeness to smoking, and the style of house construction are changeable characteristics that are statistically linked to poor Air Quality Index (AQI), according to the research. * These results give a solid foundation for public health and scientific efforts to address a significant environmental health concern through the creation of targeted interventions, the modification of housing rules, and the promotion of greener energy options. |  |
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| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The paper is scientifically flawed in its present state due to numerous significant mistakes and internal inconsistencies that compromise the validity of its data and conclusions.  Although the study's concept possesses merits, the deficiencies in its data reporting are considerable.  Significant Scientific Deficiencies  Inconsistent Data Between Text and Tables: There are direct discrepancies between the data articulated in the main text and that displayed in the tables. This constitutes a significant inaccuracy in scientific reporting.  The results indicate that 716 (88.2%) houses were not plastered, yet Table 2 demonstrates that 716 (88.2%) dwellings were plastered.  The article asserts that 684 (84.2%) of residences possessed above one-fifth of window space relative to floor area, however Table 2 distinctly indicates that this figure pertains to households with fewer than one-fifth of the floor space.  The text indicates that 720 individuals (88.7%) possessed over two-fifths of the total space, however Table 2 assigns this figure to those with fewer than two-fifths.  Inconsistent Sample Characteristics: The principal issue is the inconsistency in the sample data utilised across various analyses. The identical group of 812 households cannot possess two distinct compositions.  House Type: The descriptive data (Table 2) indicate that the sample of 812 households comprises 688 Pucca dwellings and 124 Kaccha houses. In the relationship study (Table 5), the sample of 812 homes is abruptly comprised of  264 permanent dwellings and 548 temporary houses. This essential discrepancy undermines any analysis or conclusion pertaining to the "Type of House."  Erroneous Interpretation of Results: The text inaccurately interprets data from the tables, hence exacerbating the confusion surrounding the conclusions. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | * + Sufficiency: The reference list offers a fundamental yet limited perspective on the subject. It sufficiently addresses the overarching principles of indoor air pollution and its association with health, although it lacks profundity in several aspects. For instance, it overlooks significant current literature regarding the subtle effects of various fuel sources, the implications of certain home attributes beyond fundamental ventilation, and the overarching policy framework in India. * Recency: This constitutes the principal deficiency. A significant portion of the 22 references originates from the early 2010s or earlier. Dependence on this outdated literature results in the article failing to incorporate the most recent scientific insights, contemporary national survey data, or significant policy advancements such as the Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (PMUY), a pivotal government effort aimed at enhancing clean fuel utilisation. |  |
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