

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_116904</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Micro Plastic Pollution in Soil Environment: A Comprehensive Review</b>
Type of the Article	

[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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Detailed Analysis of Weaknesses in Each Section:</b></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abstract adequately highlights the increasing significance of microplastic pollution in soils but lacks specific data on the extent of pollution and its potential impacts.</li> <li>- Keywords are relevant but could be made more specific to enhance the article's visibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While the introduction provides a good overview of the current state of microplastic pollution in soils, it lacks global data on the magnitude of the problem.</li> <li>- The importance of research in this field could be further justified by providing global data on the extent of the issue and using concrete examples to illustrate potential impacts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Literature Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The literature review is well-structured but could be strengthened by including more recent studies and discussing current gaps in knowledge regarding microplastics in soils.</li> <li>- There is a gap in critically discussing previous studies on the topic, which could weaken the credibility of the article.</li> </ul> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methodology fails to specifically describe the methods used to collect and analyze soil samples, compromising the study's reproducibility.</li> <li>- Details on sample selection criteria and analytical techniques used are lacking, which weakens the study's robustness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presented results are relevant, but the section could be enhanced by including quantitative data on microplastic concentrations in soil samples and providing statistical analyses to support conclusions.</li> <li>- A critical examination of the results and a discussion of their implications for future research are needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The discussion adequately addresses the implications of the results but could be strengthened by discussing study limitations and future research questions in more detail to enhance the article's credibility.</li> <li>- Concrete recommendations for future research and a discussion of the practical implications of the results should be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The conclusion effectively summarizes the main findings of the study but could be strengthened by emphasizing the importance of further research on microplastics in soils and providing specific recommendations for policymakers and practitioners.</li> <li>- A concise and clear summary of the main findings of the study is needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Writing Style:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writing style is generally clear and academic, but some sentences could be simplified to improve overall readability.</li> <li>- Grammatical errors and inconsistencies in style should be corrected to enhance the quality of the writing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Suggestions for Improving Each Section:</b></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include specific data and relevant keywords to increase the abstract's comprehensiveness and visibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Justify the importance of research in this field with global data and concrete examples to engage readers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Literature Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update with recent studies and critically discuss previous research to strengthen the literature review's credibility.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p><b>Methodology:</b> - Provide specific details on sample collection and analytical methods to ensure study reproducibility and robustness.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> - Include quantitative data and statistical analyses to support conclusions and enhance the results section's reliability.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> - Discuss study limitations and future research questions in more detail to strengthen the discussion section's credibility.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> - Emphasize the importance of further research and provide specific recommendations for policymakers and practitioners in the conclusion.</p> <p><b>Writing Style:</b> - Simplify sentences to improve readability and correct grammatical errors and inconsistencies in style.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Improvement Pathways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the abstract to include specific data and relevant keywords.</li> <li>- Strengthen the introduction with global data and concrete examples.</li> <li>- Update the literature review with recent studies and critical analysis.</li> <li>- Develop the methodology with specific details on methods used.</li> <li>- Improve the presentation of results with quantitative data and statistical analyses.</li> <li>- Enhance the discussion with a critical examination of study limitations and future research directions.</li> <li>- Revise the conclusion to emphasize the importance of further research and provide specific recommendations.</li> <li>- Improve the writing style for clarity and correctness.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writing style is generally clear and academic, but some sentences could be simplified to improve overall readability.</li> <li>- Grammatical errors and inconsistencies in style should be corrected to enhance the quality of the writing.</li> <li>- Simplify sentences to improve readability and correct grammatical errors and inconsistencies in style.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>While the paper addresses several relevant aspects of microplastic pollution in soils, it exhibits some shortcomings that limit its scope and relevance. For instance, the paper could benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the sources of microplastic pollution in soils, highlighting specific agricultural practices and environmental processes contributing to this issue. Moreover, a more comprehensive discussion of the potential impacts of microplastics on terrestrial ecosystems, including effects on soil biodiversity, soil fertility, and the food chain, would be beneficial in providing a comprehensive perspective on the issue.</p> <p>Additionally, the paper could enhance its methodology by providing specific details on the techniques for collecting and analyzing soil samples, as well as addressing the challenges and limitations associated with these methods. A robust methodology is essential to ensure the validity of the results and the overall credibility of the study.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ennadafy Hamza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hassan 2 Unversity, Morocco</b>