

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125523
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytolith mediated biocarbon sequestration- 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors aimed to review the formation, distribution, and storage of phytolith occluded carbon are the major factors affecting phytolith-mediated biocarbon sequestration.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Preferred to be modified into “ Phytolith-mediated Biocarbon Sequestration ”.	Revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear air for the review study. • Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keywords: Re-arrange in alphabetical order as follows: “Biocarbon sequestration, inert form of carbon, Phytolith, PhytOC”. • Introduction: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Properly arranged and clear to a certain extent. ➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • The aim: Not listed. The aim has to be listed by the end of the introduction section. • The history: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear to a certain extent. ➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • The body of the review: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear to a certain extent with good comparisons and speculation. ➤ Use the symbol “%” instead of using the word “per cent”. ➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text • Conclusion: Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • Tables: Well-presented and properly organized. • Figures and charts: Well-presented and properly organized. 	<p>Correction effected</p> <p>Done revision</p>
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlighted that Carbon sequestration has been recognized as a crucial step in reducing global warming. Biocarbon sequestration is one of the most promising approaches to long-term carbon storage.	OK
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Sufficient as 39.4% (30 out of 76) of the listed references were published in the past five years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. A certain degree of copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.	
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>	