

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105045
Title of the Manuscript:	Variation in tree species ability to capture particulate matter in industrial and urban areas
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Yes, the author evaluates the particulate matter capturing capacity of various tree species in different urban and industrial environments, the study provides valuable insights into the potential of urban trees to mitigate air pollution. This can be used for urban planning and greening strategies. 2. Yes, the title effectively conveys the study's objectives and subject matter. 3. Yes, the author has written the abstract of the research article in such a way that it provides a comprehensive overview of the study's focus, methodology, and key findings. The abstract effectively summarizes the research scope, outcomes, and implications in a concise manner, which makes it informative for readers. 4. Yes, the paper follows a clear and logical structure, starting with an abstract that provides an overview of the research. The introduction establishes the context, highlighting the significance of particulate matter pollution and its health effects. 5. Yes, the methods used are consistent with previous research in the field, and the results and conclusions are supported by the data presented. 6. The references provided in the review form are mostly recent (within the last two years) and seem to be relevant to the topic. However, to enhance the credibility and depth of the proposal, I would recommend using some additional references from peer-reviewed journals or conferences published within the last year. Apart from these points, adding more details on the specific mechanisms of how leaves capture PM, considering seasonal variations, and discussing potential limitations like tree maintenance or pollutant adherence could enhance the study's depth and applicability and enhance the understanding	Regarding the suggestion from the reviewer about specific mechanisms of how leaves capture PM, consideration of seasonal variations, and discussing potential limitations like tree maintenance or pollutant adherence, we focused mainly on screening and recommendation of tree species plantation for air pollution reduction so further research work on seasonal variations is needed.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is	
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	