



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19637
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Biochar Soil Amendment on Soil Properties and Yield of Sesame Varieties in Lafia, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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. According to study results, 10 t/ha biochar addition results in good soil quality improvement and yield increase. What about further increase to 15 t/ha or above? This issue needs to be addressed in the text. 2. Any information on the cost of biochar in Nigeria? This may enhance your argument on choosing 5 t/ha instead o 10 t/ha. 3. Selection of keywords is too general. More specific terms should be chosen to allow efficient literature search in the internet retrieval mechanism. 4. L6, 201 is typing error. 5. The meaning of sentence in L33-34 is not clear. In fact, the true meaning of "the interaction between sawdust and rice husk biochar" has not been explained in the text. 6. Many English syntax errors have been detected, in L58, L81-83, l114 L187, etc. 7. Subheading in L85 may be changed to "Climate Conditions": in L97 may be changed to "Soil and Vegetation Conditions". 8. A schematic diagram of the experimental design may help to envision the plot setup better. 9. Capitalization of words such as longitude, latitude and cmol is not necessary. 10. Please double-check on the spacing of many sentences, such as in L123, 2years. 11. In L166-167, the statement about "rice husk biochar more superior to sawdust biochar" is not obviously reflected in data of Table 1?	Biochar has limited weight, since 10t/ha can give us a good soil quality improvement and yield increase. Then, the door is open to other researchers in Nigeria to use 10t/ha as a minimum rate for application. The use of biochar in Nigerian is a new invention that is still within the research institutes and universities.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12. The numbering of tables should be all in alphabet numbers instead of spelling out English words (L186). 13. A better word for “at par” is “similar”. 14. Lots of “Discussion” is devoted to comparing previous study results (L217-227). More discussion on the study results implications may enhance quality of this article. 15. Conclusion remarks are too brief. Additions of all the significant finding details will greatly increase the scientific values of this article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a well-designed experiment. Study result findings are logical and reasonable. However, some additional content, re-writing and English syntax error corrections are necessary to enhance quality of this article.	