

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_118181
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochar application in agriculture farm-A low carbon emissions technology
Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The manuscript appears as a raw collection of material taken almost randomly from a rather wide amount of literature, showing an unacceptable high rate of misleading sentences, mostly as a result of their improvised 'out-of-context' extraction (from the said literature). Very rarely a (most needed) critical comparison is given between the pro's and con's of biochar addition into the soil. The comments that I have introduced into the manuscript help clarify my evaluation. I do not deem acceptable the manuscript as such, without a thorough revision by the author.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Not so much. Too many repetitions of same concepts in different subsections.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Scarcely.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The literature appears adequate.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Most of the time, yes. See my comments.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>Ferruccio Pittaluga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Genoa, Italy</b>