

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_114441
Title of the Manuscript:	“Response of biofertilizer and biochar on growth and yield of baby corn”
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript important for scientific community. Basically to the agro-economic expertise they can use this as an input to take masseurs on the available fertilizers.</li> <li>2. <b>My suggestion is to revise the title as alternative title,(Effect on the growth and yield of baby corn with the use of biofertilizer and biochar)</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract needs revision not all the results to be included in this section and I suggest also should be short and clear.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate but good to reduce if possible the subsections.</b></li> <li>5. <b>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct when a little revision is done.</b></li> </ol> <p>What was written in the subsections is too short e.g 3. and its subsection should be revised and extended to give adequate information to the reader. Including the conclusion it doesn't sense like to conclude what was done. You should extend and include all the basic findings of the study.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. <b>The references are not sufficient even if recent. I can able to seen only 7. I suggest adding more recent around 20 and more articles related to the work.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	It is suggested to be revised and check all are not in the report form. And abbreviation are too much countless and inconsistence it makes tiring to get the language agreement.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The manuscripts drafted in good way but should be revised in such a way that the work is clear for the scientific community to use it as reference.	

[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>Bisratewongel Tegegne</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia</b>