

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95778
Title of the Manuscript:	Persistent Organic Pollutants- A Silent Threat to the Agro-ecosystem and Surrounding Environment
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:

<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic address in this manuscript is a very important topic for the scientific community as it deals with safety and well-being of the environment. However, at times, the discussion is too shallow and general. For example, in section 3, more in depth explanation for the extraction methods is required. The authors must show the trend and progress in the extraction technology. They should show the latest technologies and development for the extraction of POPs. This would should the importance of this field as well as give ideas on future research area for those interested in this field. The same level of discussion should be done for the other sections.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract cover all the major part of the work reported.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. However, the subsection need improvement. In section 2.1.3, the authors mentioned about the industrial chemicals and focused on PFASs but there is then another specific section for it which is section 2.1.5. The authors either have to merge this section or show distinct difference between these two sections. Section 2.2.2 is too short. More discussion should be added here.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The number of reference used in the manuscript is sufficient. However, most of the reference are not current (not within 5 year, 2018-2023). Only around 20% of the reference are from work between 2018 – 2023. For a review paper, majority of the reference must by from current works. This is will highlight the importance of the review in this manuscript. The authors should update the reference and cite more current works.</p> <p>7. For section 3, the heading for the section is suggesting extraction methods for various POPs but most of the discussion is focused on the extraction of PCBs. The authors should add extraction methods for other POPs, at least the major one mentioned in section 2.</p> <p>8. The discussion in section 4 is too general. More specific information on the current and progress on the analytical methods must be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. There are few grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. It is recommended that a proof reading is done before submitting the revised version of this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khozema Bin Ahmed Ali
Department, University & Country	School of Industrial Technology, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia