

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_116199
Title of the Manuscript:	Recycling of mulberry stalk as biochar and its effect on uptake of nutrients by mulberry
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://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Comments to the Author: <u>The findings revealed that utilization of mulberry stalk as a biochar has positive effect on nutrient uptake by mulberry crop and it could partly replace chemical fertilizers and promote organic farming in a circular economy concept.</u> The authors explored the influence of mulberry stalk as a biochar and its effect on nutrient uptake by mulberry crop and the possibility that it could partly replace chemical fertilizers and promote organic farming in a circular economy concept. The manuscript is well structured and organized, the topic is relevant. However, after reviewing this research work, I believe that the followings need to be addressed in the present format. 1. The abstract is not presented quantitatively. Please include in your abstract more specific and quantitative results when it suits broader audiences, not only general information about the presented study etc. 2. Overall, the Introduction needs significant improvements, an updated and complete literature review should be conducted to present the state-of-the-art and knowledge gaps in the research. The current format is too general, local, and not specific. 4. Overall, the article exhibits deficiencies in its writing quality, with syntax and chronological order issues throughout. A careful and rigorous review should be conducted before considering it for further stages of publication acceptance. Alternatively, it is recommended that the paper be accepted with major revision.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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