

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98496
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOCHAR: A BLACK CARBON FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE
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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>After a long period (about 20 years) of research around the world, it is very important that someone is willing to do a good review. It is a work that brings valuable help to researchers of this area, presenting an overview of the current state of the art, showing what has already been done and confirmed experimentally and mainly showing what remains to be done (topics for future works) so that we can advance to the final stage: the production of food with high productivity. Thus, biochar presents itself, as demonstrated in this excellent work, as a tool of the highest importance. Congratulations to the Author.</p> <p>Yes. Yes, it is very clear.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is correctly structured. Yes, I do. Yes, I consider the references to be current and sufficient. There are 29 (30,9%) references published within the last five years. Including several doctoral theses.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexandre Ricardo Pereira Schuler
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil