

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_122487
Title of the Manuscript:	The Physics of the Carbon Cycle: About the Origin of CO2 in the Atmosphere
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>1. The manuscript could benefit from clearer evidence that it was manually written, as it currently gives the impression of heavy reliance on AI tools.</p> <p>The manuscript includes some unnecessary punctuations and font styles that might be reconsidered for consistency.</p> <p>3. Some sentences have been made more complex with additional adjectives and conjunctions that may not be necessary.</p> <p>4. The manuscript could be strengthened by providing more data to support the results.</p> <p>5. The article could align more closely with standard research paper formats, typically including five major sections: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>6. General information is usually included within the introduction; however, in this manuscript, they are presented under separate headings.</p> <p>7. A thorough alignment review prior to submission would be beneficial.</p> <p>8. If there are no specific details regarding the methods and materials, the author might consider renaming the section to "Oblique Methodology" and provide a justification for the chosen approach.</p> <p>9. It might be helpful to review other articles or papers in the same field for guidance on structure and content.</p> <p>10. The paper could be significantly improved by a complete revision to better meet publication standards.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>In introduction section, there must be an addition of a short section where the recent human efforts must also be emphasized for the climate reversal by science-based solutions, which must be supported by relevant research articles such as –</p> <p>a) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.01.006</p> <p>b) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2016.03.021</p> <p>c) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-19683-0</p> <p>d) https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.3c03435</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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:	Omkar Singh Kushwaha
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology, India