

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_97404
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Gigatonne Carbon Dioxide Removal Can Reverse Global Heating Trend</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The work done in this manuscript is very interesting. The topic related to CO<sub>2</sub> is very important as the impact of climate change is becoming more drastic with more frequent and severe disasters all around the world. Therefore, a clear understanding on the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> emission and how to reduce it is very crucial. The authors list down very interesting methods to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emission.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not clearly written. It is very difficult to capture the gist of the study from the abstract. Is this a review paper or a technical paper or opinion paper? A good abstract should have the following component: Introduction, problem statement, methodology, result/discussion and conclusion. Other than that, the abbreviation for carbon dioxide should be CO<sub>2</sub> and not "CO<sub>2</sub> or CO2" mentioned in this manuscript. The authors should standardize the use of the abbreviation and use CO<sub>2</sub> throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>4. There is no problem with structure and the sections in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The idea and content of this paper is very good and very important. It highlights the current and future situation related to CO<sub>2</sub> emission. However, his manuscript feels more like an opinion paper rather than a proper review paper. The authors must ensure that this fits with the journal's scope.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient.</p> <p>7. Even though the authors has mentioned that all of the figure are taken from their conference presentation, the authors must still put proper citation for all the figures. It is suggested that the authors at least put the source for the information in all the figures.</p> <p>8. The quality of all the images in the figure are not good. The authors should provide images with better resolution (at least 300dpi).</p> <p>9. The authors should define all the abbreviation when first using it. for the next uses, the authors should just use the abbreviation and not keep on defining it or using the full version. For example, the authors have defined carbon dioxide as CO<sub>2</sub>, however, there are few instances in the manuscript where the authors used carbon dioxide again instead of just using CO<sub>2</sub>.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, the language used is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	<b>Khozema Bin Ahmed Ali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Industrial Technology, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</b>