

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126662
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of harvesting stages on herbage and essential oil yield of rosemary (<i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i> L.) under northern dry zone of Karnataka
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	The research methodology adopted is Randomized Complete Block Design and replicated five times with five different phenological stages of harvesting namely vegetative stage, flower initiation stage, fifty per cent flowering stage, full bloom stage and seed setting stage.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Evaluating Harvesting Stages on herbage and essential oil yield of rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis L.) under northern dry zone of Karnataka Identifying the Ideal Harvesting Stage: on herbage and essential oil yield of rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis L.) under northern dry zone of Karnataka	
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.	Good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Research methodology -Randomized Complete Block Design and statistically proved	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Good work	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lekshmi.R.S
Department, University & Country	St.Joseph's College of Engineering, India