

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_115296
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of trichoderma and humic acid on vegetative growth and economics of garlic ( <i>Allium sativum</i> L.) CV. G-282
Type of the Article	

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I think that the manuscript, in terms of idea, is good. As modern science trends towards the use of biofertilizers instead of chemical fertilizers, <i>Trichoderma</i> fungus is one of the fungi used in this field.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable, but there is an error in the way the name of the <i>Trichoderma</i> is written. It usually begins with a capital letter and uses italic format.</li> <li>3. I think that the author did not succeed in writing the Abstract. It needs to be reformulated to fit the general form of the scientific Abstract. The Abstract usually begins with a line about the importance of the study, its reason, or the benefits expected from it. Then it begins by summarizing the results and ends with a line about the recommendations that the research concluded.</li> <li>4. The subsection and structure of the manuscript is good in general, but need some addition to be more quality (I referred to that in the text).</li> <li>5. Not really, I think it needs to be reformulated, more organized, and to highlight the importance of science.</li> <li>6. I think the manuscript needs more references.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The language is generally good, but there are some errors, which I mentioned in the manuscript file</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I put all my comments in the main manuscript file, so you can view them.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amal Alsulaiman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Damascus University, Syria</b>