

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_109354 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Carbon sequestration potential of different provenance of Pongamia pinnata in central India |
| Type of the Article | Original 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>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> | <p>1. The article is generally about an important scientific topic. It is an original work. However, the introduction can be written shorter. That's a lot for the introduction of an article. Additionally, the references used are outdated. Some more current articles and publications can be scanned. There are many current publications and studies on this subject.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. General information is given in the summary. I think this information should be used in the introduction. Clear expressions about the study should be used in the abstract. And the scientific data obtained as a result of this study should be disclosed.</p> <p>4. There are many grammatical errors throughout the article. It should be checked again. The spelling of the method section should be re-examined.</p> <p>5. The article is scientifically correct. But spelling errors should be corrected. and updated references can be added again.</p> <p>6. Many studies were conducted on the subject between 2010 and 2023. It is a current issue. In this context, a new literature review should be conducted.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | It is not scientifically appropriate. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | The edits given in the additional file and made to the text should be made. The article should generally be written by double-checking. | |

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: | Ibrahim Halil Hatipoglu |
| Department, University & Country | OMU, Turkiye |