

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102714</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Experimental study of biochar and energy production in a multifunction family oven</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. In this manuscript, the authors investigated the functioning of the multifunctional family oven in relation to its biochar production and duration of pyrolysis. They found that the maximum combustion temperature that initiates pyrolysis is about 800 °C and can last for 1 hour and 30 minutes. Thus, this heat is valued by the cooking of different dishes in Burkina Faso. Overall, this work is interesting and has relevance for the local scientific community.  2. Yes  3. Yes  4. Yes  5. Yes  6. Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	A full check is recommended to fix some spelling / grammatical mistakes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. Overall, the manuscript is well written and the discussions held were interesting.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eduardo Burgarelli Lages</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil</b>