

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJGMB_107486</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mitigating the harmful effect of salinity on maize plants using fish waste-derived biochar</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>Yes. Desalination of soil is a crucial task in regions of sweet water shortage. The improved quality of the soil can improve both the amount and quality of crops.</i></p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? <i>Yes</i></p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? <i>The format is uncommon and does not meet with the journal's requirements.</i></p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? <i>Yes</i></p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>Yes</i></p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <i>Yes</i></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> <p><i>References are formatted inconsistently. The Reference section usually requires abbreviated journal names, but the mixed version is intolerable. In addition, the spelling of journal names is often incorrect.</i></p>	<p>The manuscript contains useful and powerful results for improving agricultural production. Although the results and scientific content do not require significant corrections, the quality of the work is far from not only the scientific but, as well as the general writing quality. For this reason, a major revision is necessary to convert it to an acceptable manuscript.</p> <p>The authors' first task should be spell check because the manuscript contains many typos, inconsistent punctuations, and misspelled words. The authors have treated grammar in an arbitrary and idiosyncratic way. Sentences should begin with capital letters, but within a sentence, the first capital letter must always have a reason.</p> <p>The Abstract should be reformatted to meet the journal's requirements. Even in this section, the usage of units has two different versions and this inconsistency occurs throughout the manuscript. The object of the manuscript is unclear from the Abstract. The authors mentioned the millimolar concentrations of NaCl but forgot to inform the reader of the meaning of the concentration. Is that the content of the soil, the watering, or what?</p> <p>The Keywords section is absurd. The authors copied all of the presented keywords from the title. Why did the authors feel the necessity to use redundant information?</p> <p>In Table 1, there are unresolved abbreviations. All abbreviations should be defined upon the first appearance, and in tables and figures their redefinition is necessary. In the first column, the gm/Kgm is an uncommon unit. Please define it or if it is a typo, correct it. What is the meaning of pH1:2.5? What does the dS/m unit mean?</p> <p>The authors used UV-spectroscopy to calculate the UV-active ingredients. The instrumentation and recording parameters (e.g., dilution, collection time, etc.) are missing.</p> <p>The column names in Figures 1a-c, 2, 3a-c, and 4 contain typos.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? <i>It is not. Before resubmission, the manuscript needs a revision by a native English scientist.</i></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The referee attempted to identify all typos and misspelled words but could not guarantee to catch all of them.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>László Jicsinszky</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Turin, Italy</b>