

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95092
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy metals accumulation in aquatic macrophytes from Streams along the Tiko-Douala Highway, Cameroon
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript describes the use of several plant species in the phytoremediation of heavy metals. 2. Title: not suitable as the plant used in this study is not only macrophytes species. Suggest to change. 3. Abstract: the abstract does not align with the content of the manuscript. For example, in the study design stated to determine the concentration of Mg, Cd, and Pb. However, the results showed only for Cd and Pb. Furthermore, the conclusion statement in the 'abstract' and 'conclusion sections' are very contradictory. Under the conclusion part: Author(s) stated, "Mercury was the most abundant in both streams, both in sediment and water," but throughout the manuscript, no data is presented for Hg. 4. The arrangement for results and discussion is not in the appropriate sequence. There is missing data which leads to a questionable discussion and conclusion. Refer attachment. 5. Discussions are needed under the correlation analysis, not only stating the result. 6. 9/31 listed references are outdated. There are cited references but not listed in the references list and vice versa. Please double-check. 7. Please follow the journal's formatting, eg: spacing, font size, reference style, Table and Figure presentation. 8. The statistical analysis used is not explained in the method section. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Feeble language command. There are a lot of spelling, grammatical and structural mistakes. This manuscript needs comprehensive paraphrasing, structuring, editing, and proofreading. The authors also should revise the language to improve readability.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction section is ok but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more and recent references. Refer to the reviewed attachment. 2. The authors should explicitly state the novel contribution of this work. The research contributions of the paper should be articulated more clearly. <p>Material and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please describe the method to determine or choose the sampling plot/point. 2. Please describe the statistical analysis: PCA and correlation. <p>References and citation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please check and follow the reference formatting. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use recent references. 2. Please use the same style to present the species throughout the manuscript, eg: <i>Pennisetum purpureum</i> or <i>P. purpureum</i>? 3. Check the formatting of the journal. 4. Due to the contradicting result and discussion, this paper needs major revision and undergoes the review process again before publication. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

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