

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105954
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF BIOCHAR INCUBATION ON SOME PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF A TROPICAL LEACHED SOIL FROM SOUTH-WEST CHAD.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.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)
<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. The manuscript is important for scientific communities, especially those who involve in soil/land use and agriculture/horticulture. It would better if similar references in different soil and climatic conditions also mentioned as comparison.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but nor recent. Only 9 out of 40 (22.5 %) are recent (published in the last five years). Add some more recent references will improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>1. Figure 1: Use the word 'Legend' instead of 'Legende'.</p> <p>2. Figure 2: Experimental design : consist of 10 treatments instead of 9. Fix it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	--	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesia