Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_110485**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Missing the dark: Malediction for the environment and human health**
Type of the Article	**Review article**

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it comprehensively addresses the detrimental effects of artificial-light-at-night (ALAN) on various living systems, including humans, providing valuable insights into the ecological and health implications of light pollution.** **2. The title "Missing the dark: Malediction for the environment and human health" effectively conveys the essence of the article. It succinctly captures the negative impacts of light pollution on both the environment and human well-being.** **3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the article, summarizing the key points on ALAN's impact on circadian rhythms, behavioral changes, and ecological consequences. It effectively encapsulates the main findings of the manuscript.** **4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized, facilitating a logical flow of information. Each section contributes to building a thorough understanding of the topic, enhancing the clarity of the manuscript.** **5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, supported by references and detailed explanations of the physiological and ecological effects of light pollution. The use of scientific terminology and the inclusion of relevant studies contribute to the credibility of the content.** **6. The references provided are relevant and contribute to the scientific validity of the manuscript. However, it might be beneficial to include more recent references to ensure the readers are informed about the latest developments in this field. Consider incorporating studies from the last couple of years to enhance the currency of the references.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes it is	
Optional/General comments	I have added comments to the journal manuscript. Overall, the paper is well-structured and informative, and these suggestions aim to enhance clarity and engagement for readers.	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Adya Rizky Pradipta**
Department, University & Country	**Polytechnic of AKA Bogor, Indonesia**