

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_106748
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF BIOCHAR PRODUCTION PROCESS USING A PILOT CARBONIZATION KILN AS A BIOFUEL'S PROPERTIES IMPROVEMENT MODULE
Type of the Article	Experimental studies

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it deals with a process of production of biochar that can have multiple benefit in future. The manuscript appears to be relevant and important for the scientific community, particularly those involved in biochar production, biomass conversion, and biofuel research. The study explores the experimental production of biochar using a pilot carbonization kiln, offering insights into the yield and potential applications of biochar as a soil additive and biofuel precursor. It contributes to the understanding of sustainable biomass utilization and its environmental and agricultural implications.</p> <p>2. Yes, it conveys the objective of the paper clearly.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a reasonably comprehensive overview of the manuscript, summarizing the background, objectives, methodology, results, and potential applications. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the key findings and implications for a more concise summary.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate for organizing the content logically. It follows a conventional format, including an introduction, background, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure is suitable for presenting experimental research findings.</p> <p>5. Without access to the full manuscript and data, it's challenging to assess the scientific accuracy in detail. However, the methods described for biochar production (pyrolysis) and the yield calculations align with established principles in bioenergy research. To ensure scientific accuracy, it's essential to provide sufficient details on experimental procedures, controls, and data analysis in the full manuscript.</p> <p>6. The manuscript cites relevant references, including sources on biomass pyrolysis and biochar production. I could not check the reference list thoroughly. Its seems to be ok.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. Charring ratio mentioned as 125.9 on page 7, Table-1. Request to recheck this figure.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chanchal Dass
Department, University & Country	India