

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_114867
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochar Activation: A Sustainable Carbon Production from Biomass
Type of the 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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</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 selected topic is up to date and crucially important in terms of decarbonisation of society. Delivered results are poorly interpreted, however.</li> <li>2. Yes</li> <li>3. Yes, although could be improved. Chief results <u>must</u> be mentioned.</li> <li>4. Yes</li> <li>5. No, the manuscript contains serious shortcomings. Most importantly, references are in <u>huge lack</u>, as scientific paper should always be written on a strong research background.</li> <li>6. References are scarce. Full introduction is based on around 5 references. This has to be improved and thorough literature research must be performed.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Language is readable, however, many mistakes and typos are present. <b>Numerous</b> spaces are lacking where they should be.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>After implementing the remarks in reviewer letter, especially enhancing its scientific quality through references, discussions, and results comparisons and interpretation, the manuscript might reach the journal quality and be accepted for publication (after secondary revision). <b>Remarks are summarised below.</b></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>Jakub Čespiva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>VSB - Technical University of Ostrava, Czechia</b>