

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118675
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of organic amendments on ginger (<i>Zingiber officinale rosc.</i>) growth, yield and economics
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I think the work has potential towards adding value to the scientific community. There is a notable absence of considerations of 'economic' aspect of the topic in both the introduction and discussion sections. Including economics in the introduction, discussion and conclusion could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topic. The abstract presents challenges in terms of clarity and coherence, making it difficult for readers to grasp the key points and objectives of the study easily. Streamlining the abstract to enhance its readability and coherence would greatly benefit the overall presentation of the research. The document exhibits inconsistency in its structure, with separate sections titled "Results and Discussion" and "Discussion." To improve clarity and organization, the author should streamline the structure by consolidating these sections into either "Results and Discussion" or distinct sections for "Results" and "Discussion," but not both simultaneously. It appears that statistical analysis may not have been conducted on the provided data, raising questions about the rigor and reliability of the findings. For the figures and tables, there are no letters indicating significance, and the figures also lack error bars. Conducting statistical analysis is crucial for validating the results and ensuring their accuracy and robustness. The manuscript suffers from a lack of references, particularly in the introduction and discussion sections. Incorporating relevant references would not only provide essential context and support for the study's findings but also enhance the credibility and scholarly rigor of the research. Moreover, the discussion section predominantly interprets the results without offering referenced reasoning behind them, detracting from the depth and validity of the analysis. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The overall quality of the English language in this manuscript requires minor touch-ups to enhance its suitability for scholarly communication. Specifically, the author should review the entire document carefully to ensure proper spacing between words and correct any grammatical or typographical errors. This attention to detail will significantly improve the readability and professionalism of the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 26: after the comma, remove the capital letter "T" so that the sentence reads as " , the plant is indigenous..." The first 6 sentences of the introduction do not have references, provide references. Each paragraph has about 1 reference, the introduction overall lacks references, add more references to all the statements made. For instance, you have stated that "<u>Fresh ginger has 80.9 percent moisture, 2.3 percent protein, 0.9 percent fat, percent minerals, 2.4 percent fiber, and 12.3 percent carbohydrates, while powdered rhizome has 3-6 percent fatty oil, 9 percent protein, 60-70 percent carbohydrates, 3-8 percent crude fiber, about 8% ash, 9-12 percent water, 4-7.5 percent oleoresin and percent volatile oil.</u>" But did not provide a reference for this bold statement. Line 49-50: What damages pertaining to your study has it caused? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are your study objectives? Towards the end of the introduction, clearly state the research problem and how you plan to address it through your study by clearly outlining the objectives. <p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Line 59-60: Kindly provide the GPS coordinates of the study location.• Line 59: Begin by writing the full names of HRS, BCKV, and WB, with their abbreviations in brackets, and then continue to use the abbreviations thereafter.• Include a figure(s)/map(s) displaying where the study was carried out,• Line 62-63: rewrite this sentence because ploughing cannot be 'given'. => <u>"To prepare raised beds (15 cm) repeated ploughing at a depth of 30 cm was given to make the soil friable and pulverized"</u>.• Line 72: What is going on with treatment 4? What does T₄ (FYM@23 (15+8) t ha⁻¹) mean?• Regarding treatments, what is your control treatment? State it. Typically, pure soil with no added treatment serves as the control group in experiments. This control group provides a baseline against which the effects of various treatments can be compared. By comparing the outcomes of treated groups to the control, you can statistically analyze and quantify the impact of the treatments. This approach allows for a clear assessment of how the treatments influence the experimental outcome, enabling you to draw meaningful conclusions about the efficacy and effectiveness of the treatments.• You have a treatment solely with FYM. Why isn't there a treatment solely with neem cake?• Line 92: You have stated that <u>"Gross income was calculated by multiplying the rhizome yield by the prevailing market price of the rhizome"</u>, now provide a reference for where you got this equation.• Line 93: You stated that <u>"Net income per hectare was calculated by subtracting the cost of cultivation from gross income"</u>, now provide a reference.• Line 94: You stated that <u>"The Benefit: Cost ratio was worked out by using the following formula"</u> yet did not provide the formula.• Reconstruct this sentence because the reference [3] is placed in an odd location => <u>"For the determination of critical difference (C.D.) at 5% level of significance, [3] tables were consulted"</u>. <p>Results and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that all tables and figures include letters indicating significance or differences between treatment means. Use "ns" to denote nonsignificant differences.• For figures, include error bars and display letters atop error bars.• In tables, provide a note at the bottom indicating that different letters for the same factor within a column indicate significant differences ($p < 0.05$), while "ns" denotes nonsignificant differences.• Centre your discussion around treatments that had a significant impact. Provide reasons and references to support your analysis and statements made.• Structure your document with either "Results and Discussion" or separate sections for "Results" and "Discussion," but not both. <p>Discussion</p> <p>The discussion section lacks depth and fails to provide adequate support for the claims made. It lacks thorough reasoning and neglects to cite relevant references to substantiate its assertions. Moreover, it merely reiterates information already presented in the results section without offering meaningful analysis or interpretation. Additionally, the discussion is overly concise and fails to thoroughly explore the significance of the treatment means. It appears that the treatments may not have undergone comprehensive statistical analysis, as there is no evidence of such analysis reflected in the figures provided. Therefore, the discussion falls short of providing a robust analysis of the experimental findings and their implications.</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion is notably brief and lacks depth, offering little of substantive value or insights gleaned from the study. It is only 2 lines and fails to establish a meaningful connection to the topic or to address the hypothesis or goals of the study, which were not clearly delineated in the introduction. To enhance the clarity and effectiveness of the conclusion, it is essential to set clear objectives in the introduction and ensure that the conclusion aligns with these objectives. Additionally, providing more contextual information in the conclusion can help bridge any gaps in the existing literature and offer a more comprehensive understanding of the study's implications. Moreover, it is crucial to reflect on the lessons learned from the study and to suggest avenues for future research to address the identified shortcomings and further advance the field. By incorporating these elements, the conclusion can become a more robust and impactful component of the research.</p> <p>Check the entire document and make sure that you put space between words.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siviwe Odwa Malongweni
Department, University & Country	University of the Free State, South Africa