

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118833
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of seaweed extracts on yield and quality of black cumin (<i>Nigella sativa</i> L.) with organic input management
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. The authors tackle a broad and interesting topic in their research, the results of which I describe in the article. The use of seaweed as a biostimulator for fertilization, the application of this biostimulator to the cumin culture and variants of foliar or granular and mixed application. The main theme is the comparison of the effects of applying SWM in foliar, granular and mixed forms on the growth of the cumin crop. The originality stems not only from the geographical location but also from the mixed variants of application of the stimulator. The research carried out by the authors confirms the research of other authors on other types of plants. Such well-archived research, whose data can be focused on directions of exploitation in plant growth, has value through the new data they produce and by confirming previous research. Archiving and theoretical research will continue in databases related to GIS. Also, the application recommendations of the treatment with the best results, have value for local farmers. About the possible applications and valorisation of such results, the conclusions are very few and uncertain in the sense that a certain variant can (it is not certain) produce better performances of the cumin culture. This means that the research must be consolidated to be published at a higher level. 2. Yes the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the structure and the subsections of the article are appropriate. 5. The general scientific framework is correct. It is statistically processed with well-chosen methods from descriptive and inferential statistics, experimental data obtained in field experiments on the cumin culture fertilized in 10 variants (one is a control) and based on certain criteria (of quantity and quality of the harvest) the variants are chosen that lead to the best results. This is a classical way of approaching such problems, in which theory is almost useless. In this correct general scheme, the authors have some shortcomings that do not allow publication for the time being. Lack 1) The authors do not present a map of the location of the experimental field and the harvest processing laboratories, on the territory of India; Lack 2) List a sketch or photographic images of the experimental field; Lack 3) There are no data on the isolation measures of the plots with different fertilization treatments included in the study; Lack 4) There are no photographic images of the harvest obtained on various plots for comparative purposes (visible evidence of the sought effects). Lack 5) To facilitate discussions and quick understanding of the results, useful graphs can be used to evaluate the results from a qualitative and comparative point of view. For the article to be published, the noted deficiencies must be remedied. 6. The References are sufficient and recent. There are two works in the list of references whose citations I did not find in the text of the manuscript. These are noted in the reviewed manuscript attached to the review. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used in the manuscript has quite a few errors, but these are simple and easy to control (most articles, and many due to the version of English used - US, UK or India). For this reason, the text of the manuscript must be subjected to rigorous control with the facilities of the text editor or with specific programs (Grammarly, Quill Bot, free or licensed versions). When rewriting the text or correcting it, we recommend prior negotiation with the publisher or agreement with the Template approved by the publisher, on the English version used.	
Optional/General comments	Taking into account comments 1.-5., I awarded grade 6 with the requirement of major revision.	

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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania