

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97626
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIALITY OF WEED PLANTS FOR PHYTOREMEDIATION OF HEAVY METAL POLLUTED SOIL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>1- Phytoremediation is an environmentally friendly remediation process. The audience and the scientific community would appreciate any new information. The paper needs to be organized, and more information is needed.</p> <p>2- Yes it is suitable.</p> <p>3- The abstract is not comprehensive and needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>4- The methods and procedures are not well done.</p> <p>5- The authors need to answer my questions to verify the scientific merit of the paper.</p> <p>6- The references are very old. The authors are required to use reference from the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality is poor. The pare should be reviewed by a professional editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Methods and the procedure are not clear: You need to provide information about the method and the procedure followed step by step and clearly describe the procedure, then use the references. The references are very old. The authors are required to use reference from the last 5 years. You need to clearly state the timeline of this study; when was the study conducted? Lines 7-11: Remove the text and add details about the experimental program setup, time, some numbers, data, and results.</p> <p>Lines 39-43: Rewrite this part; do not use " So" or " like" in academic writing. Use scientific words.</p> <p>Lines 61-72: In this paragraph, present the differences between your work and the previous work, the importance of your work, the novelty of your work (if any), and the new information that will be gained from this study.</p> <p>Lines 74-77: In the last paragraph of the introduction, you need to talk about your experiences.</p> <p>Line 81: What country?</p> <p>Line 88 : Provide a Figure showing that</p> <p>Line 93: How many fields?</p> <p>Line 96 : Was the bag autoclaved, sterile or not?</p> <p>Line 97 : What do you mean There is no difference in soil profile for all the samples</p> <p>Line 98: How did you dry the soil? How did you crush the soil?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Line 99: How come? Dried soil samplesto make air dry?</p> <p>Line 101: Provide a Table showing the samples and the information.</p> <p>Line 125: Provide a Table showing the samples and the information.</p> <p>Line 164: Add the details of the methods here, the procedure and then use the reference.</p> <p>Line 188 : Provide the details here. What have you done?</p> <p>Line 189: What type of test did you use?</p> <p>Line 193: How did you determine the percentage of silt in the soil sample?</p> <p>Line 199: Table 2 is not explained in the text. Provide details about the soils included in table 2. From where did you get these samples, and how?</p> <p>Line 202 : Table 2 is not explained in the text?</p> <p>Line 224-225: How did you determine the bulk density of the soil? You need to show that in the methods.</p> <p>Line 233: Why is the bulk density high in the summer and low in the winter?</p> <p>Line 238: What is the control soil samples? You have talked about it in the method?</p> <p>Line 242: Explain the results and the data.</p> <p>Line 397-403 : Rewrite the conclusion, including numbers from the results.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ikrema Hassan
Department, University & Country	University of New Brunswick, Canada