

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_123613
Title of the Manuscript:	The effectiveness of biochar on the growth and yield of the Ansal tomato variety.
Type of the 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.	The use of biochar has some advantages on crop growth and development. However, in this study the author unravels its importance on yield and quality. More supporting datas to be added to strengthen the manuscript. This topic follows recent trend, however the manuscript quality is very poor to communicate the research to scientific community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Changes to be carried out in title of the manuscript as "Impact of biochar on evaluating the growth and yield performance of 'Ansal' tomato variety"	
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.	Yes, abstract needs additions and modifications as per suggestions mentioned in comments	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, manuscript need to be restructured with subsections	
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.	The topic is technically sound but the author requires effort to change the manuscript and rewrite. This article has major changes and doesn't follow the journal guidelines	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References should be added more and should be still more recent with discussed findings. Introduction needs reference, materials and method: observations recorded needed to be explained with reference, In results and discussion: results should be first followed by discussion where requires addition of references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No quality is poor, Kindly make major changes	
Optional/General comments	Kindly rewrite the manuscript as per suggestions, Entire manuscript should be written according to journal guidelines	

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:	K A Mumithra Kamatchi
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India