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PART 1: Comments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The study is relevant from an environmental perspective, addressing the use of native plants, of great amplitude and productivity, as a viable and sustainable option for the mitigation of pollutants such as cadmium and lead from the environment. There is a growing demand for sustainable technologies for the treatment of water or solutions contaminated by these pollutants that are widely disseminated in anthropogenic products and processes. In summary, this research contributes to deepening the understanding of the physical-chemical mechanisms  involved in the process of removing these metals from water. | Sincerely appreciate the esteemed reviewer for the feedback |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is adequate, but not attractive. I also suggest avoiding the use of parentheses. My suggestion for a title change would be "Evaluation of two species of macrophytes in the phytoremediation of water pollutants" or "Aquatic macrophytes as remediators of Pb and Cd from water". | Thank you for your valuable feedback. I appreciate your suggestion to make the title more concise and attractive. Based on your suggestions, I have revised the title to: **"** **"Phytoremediation of Metal Contamination: Evaluating *Pistia stratiotes* and *Eichhornia crassipes* for Lead and Cadmium Removal"**. I hope this title is more in line with your expectations. |
| **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.** | The abstract is informative, but it goes too far in presenting the results in a way that is too specific for an abstract. For example, "... 21st day and 28th day as 52.02 mg kg-1, 34.61 mg kg-1; 53.82 mg kg-1 and 46.83 mg kg-1 ..." and "... were 78.95, 178.53 and 89.91, 365.10...". Summarize information like this, highlighting only the most significant findings in the abstract. | The change has been incorporated |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript was written clearly and addresses the terms of the field appropriately. | Thank you for the Feedback |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The manuscript is well supported by references. However, I suggest, as a way of complementing it, that more recent references be included, considering that phytoremediation is a very versatile field of study with many new developments. For example, in the last paragraph of the introduction it is possible to find more recent studies  related to the subject addressed. | The change has been incorporated and thank you for the Feedback |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The quality of the language is adequate. | Sincerely appreciate the esteemed reviewer for the feedback |
| **Optional/General** comments | In summary, the study is relevant in the context of phytoremediation of water contaminated with metals that are frequently associated with environmental pollution and bring aspects of toxicity to exposed populations, thus providing information of great public utility. The text is well written, the figures and tables are adequate and sufficiently clear. However, the article could be improved in some aspects, such as a better summary, a better organization of the information in the introduction section, the updating of the reference framework and the inclusion of the hypothesis or objectives of the study (which were not sufficiently clear). That said, I suggest  accepting the article subject to minor revisions. | The change has been incorporated. Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive feedback. I am pleased to hear that you found the study relevant and that the text, figures, and tables were clear and adequate. I appreciate your suggestions for improvement, particularly regarding the summary, organization of the introduction, updating the reference framework, and clarification of the study's hypothesis and objectives. |
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|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with the 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?** | No | Thank you for the Feedback |