

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_121126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimization of Ruscus hypophyllum L. Growth Using Manure and Nitrogen Applications in Subtropical Conditions of Punjab</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	It allows us to know an optimal combination of fertilization to produce <i>Ruscus hypophyllum</i> , and demonstrates how harmful overfertilization is to the development of the plant.	
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?	Yes, but they have to remove the “:”	
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.	It provides information for <i>the Ruscus hypophyllum</i> producing community, for the robustness of the research using a randomized experimental design and with clear treatments, the measurement variables corresponding to the crop and its number of repetitions, it also carries out a discussion with other authors on the same topic. .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but according to the information in the journal template, it does not have the structure.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I consider the visualization of the graphs to be not the most appropriate, I recommend using bar graphs. Furthermore, the figures are not cited in the text.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Miguel Armando López Beltrán</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México</b>