

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111451
Title of the Manuscript:	Nature Based Solutions: Carbon Sequestration by Standing Trees In Urban Parks and Gardens of Katni City in Madhya Pradesh, India
Type of the Article	Case study

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 manuscript presents a thorough study conducted in Katni, highlighting the carbon sequestration capabilities of its parks and gardens. It identifies diverse tree species contributing to carbon sequestration and underscores the role of urban green spaces in addressing climate change. The findings offer valuable insights into factors affecting carbon accumulation, including park size, species diversity, and local influences. This research is of importance to the scientific community, enhancing our understanding of urban carbon sequestration and suggesting potential strategies for environmental management and conservation.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. While the presented abstract is informative and effectively outlines the crucial facets of the research, it is recommended that the authors review it to ensure a succinct yet thorough summary of the study.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references provided cover a broad range of sources. The inclusion of diverse references, both from academic journals and reports, is beneficial for providing a comprehensive background to support the manuscript's content.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript exhibits clear and formal language; however, there is room for improvement in refining the style and language to enhance overall clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider reviewing the abstract to ensure that it provides a concise yet comprehensive summary of the study. ▪ Enhance the introduction by clearly articulating the research gap and the specific objectives of the study. ▪ The methodology employed in the study would benefit from a more detailed explanation to enhance clarity and facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the research approach. ▪ Emphasize the practical applications and implications of the findings for policymakers, urban planners, and environmentalists. ▪ Double-check for consistency in language, terminology, and formatting. 	

[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?	There are no apparent ethical issues. The study is carried out in accordance with standard ethical guidelines for scientific research.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Laaroussi Amale
Department, University & Country	Moulay Ismail University, Morocco