

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_100208
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOREMEDIATION: AN EFFECTIVE WAY TO TREAT HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION- A REVIEW
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript presents a concise summary of extensive research on heavy metal contamination and the potential of phytoremediation as a solution. The content provides a comprehensive overview of the harmful effects of contamination on global environmental health, as well as the mechanisms and practical applications of phytoremediation for reducing heavy metal concentrations in soil. Overall, this manuscript contains valuable and informative insights that should garner attention from the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Perhaps the title should be a little reformulated as: PHYTOREMEDIATION: AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH FOR TREATING HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION – A REVIEW</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the manuscript and effectively engages potential readers with the topic at hand. It presents sufficient information to pique the interest of readers and provide them with a clear understanding of what to expect from the study.</p> <p>4. The manuscript demonstrates a well-structured and cohesive framework that effectively leads readers into the topic with a detailed and systematic approach. The progression of the content is logical and organized, allowing for a comprehensive exploration of the subject matter.</p> <p>5. My opinion is that manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are relevant and compatible with the topic.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ljiljana Babincev</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Pristina, Serbia</b>