

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>)

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)	The paper entitled "POTENTIALITY OF WEED PLANTS FOR PHYTOREMEDIATION OF HEAVY METAL POLLUTED SOIL" discusses about the weed plants that has a potential as phytoremediation of heavy metal. However, the authors did not provide enough justification for their objectives. You may find my detailed comments in the reviewed manuscript as attached.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1. There are lot of grammatical mistakes: recommended for certified proofreading. 2. The abbreviations must be effectively utilized throughout the manuscript. 3. The paper lack of scientific justification and does not adhere to the given conclusion. 4. Outdated references: 3/50 is within 5 years (2017-2019, no reference 2020-2023).	

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:	Nurul Ain Jamion
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia