



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_49509
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Aerosolized Coal Fly Ash in the Global Plankton Imbalance: Case of Florida's Toxic Algae Crisis
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	NO	
Minor REVISION comments	NO	
Optional/General comments	<p>This article is some kind of a rare "pearl" which may easily be overseen by ordinary deep sea-divers. But a truly open-minded seeker will instantly realize its genuine worth. As this paper is really an authentic piece of artwork standing as a mirror to so many bulky scientific findings promoted as universal truths but which are only one-sided hologram of a larger, more comprehensive and painful truth. This paper is actually showing that there is always another darker side of the "Moon" which should be looked on to complete the whole, correct story. And the "story-tellers" are real wizards when twisting, swirling, swindling and inter-twinning almost encyclopaedic existing information into a scientifically magical display of counter-arguments and demonstrations composing the opposite image of the continuum spectrum regarding the influence of CFA on natural ecosystems and humans. For their power of scientific speculation and conviction of their share of the "unified field of the truth", they absolutely deserve their voice to be heard...</p> <p>From a mere scientific standpoint, this paper is highly interesting and valuable as it minutely describes how some sort of harmful algal bloom (HBA) that grow out of control, are creating real tides poisoning fish, birds, shellfish and marine ecosystems plus humans living in most affected coastal areas. The evidence being brought forth by the authors is miscellaneous, covering a wide array of scientific research: biology, oceanography, geology, geography, climatology, engineering, toxicology etc. Of course, as a reviewing article, this paper is very well documented and all processes are explained in essential but very clear terms so that no misunderstanding may occur.</p> <p>The main directions of research point to the followings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main factor of the explosive growth of harmful algae is atmospheric pollution with iron-containing CFAs released into the atmosphere either from coal-burning utilities or from jet-spraying; - The arguments concerning especially the particulate pollution are extremely correct, as they have already been proven by outstanding scientists worldwide; - Forensic scientific studies being mentioned have shown that CFA represents the main aerosolized toxic compound of particulate pollution, with certified negative effects on human health; - In Florida (US), as in most of coastal areas in the world, the HABs are mainly caused by cyanobacteria, which may pose very serious strain on all aquatic ecosystems and public health; - HABs are primarily determined by nutrient composition of waters, especially with high CFA iron inputs, which may significantly produce changes of phytoplankton/algae populations on a global basis, severely affecting fish, bird, mammal and human populations alike. <p>In conclusion, for all their hard work and perseverance, together with their exquisite, unique way of presenting things with so much scientific passion, the authors of this article truly deserve to be appreciated and congratulated.</p>	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ionac Nicoleta</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Bucharest, Romania</i>