

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	Research

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.	See later	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have read the article thoroughly and I find it very interesting. This study fits perfectly within the scope of the journal. The experimental effort is consistent, so as the amount of original data presented. The indicated experiment seems appropriate to achieve the stated purposes, and the topic is worth to be investigated because some results obtained could be promising. However, the manuscript needs improvements before publications.</p> <p>In the manuscript, the scientific question is not well expressed in the introduction. Authors should focus their introductions on arguing for progress related to the core questions of your research.</p> <p>In the manuscript appear: "the guidelines established in QCVN 01-63:2011/BNNPTNT, issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Vietnam". For an international journal, perhaps another criterion should be used; or at least explained.</p> <p>If it is posible, add photo of the experimental design</p> <p>A conclusions section needs to be added</p> <p>References appear in different formats; please combine and follow the journal's guidelines.</p> <p>I wish those changes will contribute to improve your paper.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Raomundo Jimenez Ballesta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Autonoma of Madrid, Spain</p>