

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4600
Title of the Manuscript:	Marine Debris: A Global Environmental Challenge to Coastal Diversity
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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 provides a review of the global environmental challenge of marine debris, also focusing on its impact on coastal diversity. This study by synthesizing current knowledge on marine debris (types, sources, decomposition rates, and impacts), highlighted the need for effective management strategies to decrease its negative impacts on marine ecosystems, and human health. Additionally, it underscores the socioeconomic implications of marine debris and interdisciplinary approaches.	

<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable. However, it could be slightly refined. My suggested alternative title is: ((Marine Debris: A Global Environmental and Socioeconomic Challenge to Coastal and Marine Ecosystems)). This is more closely with the content of the manuscript.</p>	<p>Title of manuscript id revised as:</p> <p>Marine Debris: A Global Environmental and Socioeconomic Challenge to Coastal and Marine Ecosystems.</p>
<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 of the article provides a good overview of the key points discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition: Adding a sentence on socioeconomic Impacts of marine debris effects on fisheries, aquaculture, and human health</p> <p>Suggestions for Deletion: The sentence (It also results in ingestion, entanglement, kill, maim and drown marine animals due to increased transport of pollutants into food chains) could be slightly rephrased for clarity.</p>	<p>Following information was added in the abstract.</p> <p>The socioeconomic effects of marine debris were observed on maritime sectors (fisheries and aquaculture, coastal communities and tourism, costs of beach cleaning); high concern of the society about marine debris; and human health risks (injuries due to pieces of glass, metal fragments, discarded syringes and medical waste).</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and well-researched; it uses credible sources, including articles and reports from international organizations (NOAA, IUCN, UNEP). Discussion aligns with current scientific understanding, accurately describing the physical, chemical, and ecological impacts of marine debris. Finally, proposed management strategies are consistent with current scientific recommendations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>While many of the references are recent (from 2021-2023), to ensure the manuscript reflects the key areas, so below are some suggestions for additional references that could enhance the manuscript:</p> <p>Smith, M., Love, D. C., Rochman, C. M., & Neff, R. A. (2018). Microplastics in Seafood and the Implications for Human Health. Current Environmental Health Reports, 5(3), 375-386.</p> <p>Gheshlaghi, P., & Daliri, M. (2018). Marine debris: Evaluating sources, impacts, and practical solutions.</p>	<p>As per reviewer's suggestions, following references were incorporated in the text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Smith M, Love D C, Rochman C M, Neff R A. Microplastics in Seafood and the Implications for Human Health. Current Environmental Health Reports, 2018; 5(3): 375-386. 2. Gheshlaghi P, Daliri M. Marine debris: Evaluating sources, impacts, and practical solutions.

	Journal of the Persian Gulf (Marine Science), 9(34), 37–45. López-Martínez, S., Morales-Caselles, C., Kadar, J., & Rivas, M. L. (2021). Overview of the global status of plastic pollution and regulatory policies to mitigate its impact. *Environmental Science & Policy, 115, 1-10.	Journal of the Persian Gulf (Marine Science), 2018; 9(34): 37–45. 3. López-Martínez S, Morales-Caselles C, Kadar J, Rivas M L. Overview of the global status of plastic pollution and regulatory policies to mitigate its impact. *Environmental Science & Policy, 2021; 115: 1-10.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some sentences are overly long or complex, making them difficult to read or follow. Moreover, minor grammatical errors, missing commas, incorrect use of semicolons and awkward phrasings could be corrected.	Complete text was checked for grammatical corrections, if any.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript seems to lack critical analysis, relying heavily on summarizing existing studies. -In the introduction, some sentences are a little repetitive, especially when listing impacts. -The materials and methods section is brief. It doesn't detail the search criteria, which is important for reproducibility. -The conclusion summarizes the main points but doesn't introduce new insights or highlight gaps in the current research that future studies could address.	Critical analysis, and scope for future research was added in the text.

PART 2:

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