

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123308
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Biochar Derived from Rice straw and Soybean straw
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	It is an interesting subject of study due to its significance for several reasons, including the use of agricultural waste, the improvement of soil functions, and the associated environmental benefits. However, I believe the author could further explore this field of research. The focus is solely on biochar, but pyrolysis produces three main products. What happens to the other products if only the biochar is utilized? Additionally, why were these specific feedstocks chosen?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable, but I believe it could be improved. Since the manuscript primarily focuses on the application of biochar as a soil fertilizer, it might be beneficial to emphasize this aspect more prominently in the title.	
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.	In the abstract, it might be helpful to include the reasoning behind why the biochars obtained can enhance plant growth and soil productivity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>Yes.</u>	
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>The main improvements needed in this manuscript relate to the Materials and Methods section. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the characteristics of the pyrolysis drum? • What are the conditions of pyrolysis in this drum? • Is the yield of biochar calculated on a dry or wet basis? • The equations for calculating moisture, ash, and volatile matter require more detailed procedural descriptions. • The equation for calculating fixed carbon is incorrect. • Figure and table captions need improvement. • Figures and tables must be cited in the text. <p>• Is there any article that has applied biochar with similar characteristics to those you obtained as a fertilizer and achieved good results?</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The most recent reference is from 2023. It might be worthwhile to cite some even more recent references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some grammatical errors and typos that need to be corrected. Additionally, some terms do not appear to be the correct technical ones.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vilmar Steffen
Department, University & Country	Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná – UTFPR, Brazil