General comment

The concept of the current article is excellent and globally necessary; it is also substantial and well-designed, with results presented clearly and concisely. However, the authors are encouraged to review the manuscript thoroughly and carefully rectify the following errors.

Specific points

- ✓ In the abstract section, more quantitative and key results from the various disciplines used in this review are needed. Moreover, not preferable to use, in our opinion, in this section.
- ✓ Line 39: What does 2.4-2 mean? Please correct it
- ✓ Line 43: Is the Carboniferous considered an era or period belonging to the Paleozoic era?
- ✓ Generally, the Introduction reads well, presenting a reasonable understanding; however, the novelty/what knowledge gap investigated deserves a better explanation
- ✓ Line 84: Describe any abbreviation at its first mention and continue to use it consistently throughout the entire manuscript (e.g., Molybdenum (Mo)).
- ✓ Line 143: Unified writing formats are required, including bold text font, bracket colours, ...
- ✓ Lines 145-154: Reduce the size of the figures' captions to distinguish them from the manuscript text. Add more details on Figure 2.