

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127190
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effect of Biochars on the Growth of Afzelia africana and Pterocarpus erinaceus in Nursery Conditions in Faranah, Guinea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides significant insights into the role of different biochar types in enhancing the growth and biomass of <i>Azelia africana</i> and <i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i>, two ecologically and economically important forest species in West Africa. It contributes to the scientific understanding of species-specific soil amendments and the potential of biochar as a sustainable tool for reforestation efforts in tropical regions, addressing critical issues like soil fertility and forest ecosystem restoration. The study's rigorous methodology, including the use of multiple biochar treatments and thorough statistical analyses, adds to its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, <i>Comparative Effect of Biochars on the Growth of Azelia africana and Pterocarpus erinaceus in Nursery Conditions in Faranah, Guinea</i>, is suitable as it clearly outlines the key components of the study: the comparative analysis, the specific species examined, and the location. However, if a more focused or engaging title is preferred, consider:</p> <p>Alternative Title: <i>Assessing Biochar Impacts on the Nursery Growth of Azelia africana and Pterocarpus erinaceus in Faranah, Guinea</i></p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's aims, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. It provides a clear overview of the biochar types used, the species studied, and the results, making it easy for readers to understand the core contributions of the research.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Addition: Including a brief mention of the specific statistical methods used (like ANOVA and Tukey's post-hoc tests) would enhance the abstract by giving more insight into the study's analytical rigor. Clarification: The abstract could benefit from a more explicit mention of the practical implications of the findings, especially how the results could influence future reforestation practices or soil management strategies. Conciseness: Consider streamlining the section on the results to focus only on the most impactful findings, as some details could be left for the main text. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well organized, starting with an Introduction that clearly outlines the study's context and objectives, followed by a detailed Materials and Methods section that describes the experimental setup and data analysis methods. The Results and Discussion sections are distinct, allowing the findings to be presented clearly and interpreted in relation to existing literature. Finally, the Conclusion succinctly summarizes the key outcomes and practical implications.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined experimental design, which employs a randomized complete block structure to minimize variability and ensure reliable results. The use of rigorous statistical analyses, such as ANOVA and Tukey's post-hoc tests, lends credibility to the findings and demonstrates a comprehensive approach to evaluating the effectiveness of various biochars. Additionally, the inclusion of multiple biochar treatments allows for a nuanced understanding of species-specific responses, enhancing the applicability of the results for reforestation efforts. The careful measurement of growth parameters and the correlation analysis further validate the study's conclusions, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and recent, including key studies relevant to biochar, soil management, and reforestation (e.g., Lehmann & Joseph, 2015; Anderson et al., 2022). The selection of references covers foundational concepts as well as up-to-date research, ensuring a comprehensive theoretical background.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To strengthen the discussion on the ecological impact of biochar in tropical environments, consider adding recent reviews or meta-analyses on biochar applications in forestry, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Biochar for Forest Ecosystems: A Comprehensive Review of the Benefits and Risks" (recent journal article or review from 2020-2023). If available, including references on long-term field trials or case studies of biochar applications in similar West African regions could enhance the practical relevance of the study. <p>These additions would provide a more complete picture of the current scientific understanding and practical considerations related to biochar use in reforestation.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the article's language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is written in clear and concise English, using appropriate scientific terminology and a professional tone. The sentences are well-structured, and the ideas are presented logically, making the content accessible to an academic audience.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the manuscript for minor grammatical issues or awkward phrasing, as a few instances may benefit from slight rewording for clarity. - Consider simplifying complex sentences where possible to enhance readability without losing the depth of scientific explanation. <p>Overall, the language is effective for scholarly communication, with only minimal revisions needed for improvement.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aashish Gyawali
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Sciences, Tribhuvan University, Nepal