

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118754
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF GREEN MANURES TO REDUCE HEAVY METAL TOXICITY: A Review
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript: it aims to describe the use of green manure to alleviate/mitigate heavy metal toxicity in the environment. This is an interesting topic to tackle especially for sustainable agriculture. Since there are few studies in this area this review will encourage researchers to start looking into this area. Title: is suitable and can attract readers. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes. References: Authors seem to write long paragraphs and include a single reference. The references need improvement, throughout the entire manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English is of good quality, and it will be easy for the readers to understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This review is poorly written, meaning it only describes/defines terms and not reviewing different studies. <i>E.g</i> authors should review different research articles/studies, which describe the use of green plants or manure for heavy metal management. I have provided some studies to use and to search for more articles below https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.130517 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.07.040 Authors tend to write long paragraphs and only include one reference, NB: A review article is meant to review different studies. Table 1: The subheading must be revised. Include references for the sources of these heavy metals. Chart1: The subheading must be revised. Figure 1. The source of this figure must be referenced. The quality of the figure can be improved. Figure 3, seems incomplete. Table 2, lacks references. 	

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:	Takalani Mulaudzi-Masuku
Department, University & Country	University of the Western Cape, South Africa