

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124957
Title of the Manuscript:	Synergistic Effect of Organic Inputs on the Morphophysiological Traits of Sweet Basil (<i>Ocimum basilicum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Resaerch Article

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Organic farming is gaining importance all over the world and the use of organic substances in plant production is increasing. Although similar studies are needed in this sense, the research has been inadequate in terms of the way of handling and evaluation statistically.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Even the title focused on 'Morphophysiological Traits', there is no concern with biological interrelationships between form and function, just morphologic observations were recorded.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract should summarize the promising treatment and results, briefly. In this way, it's hard to understand.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The material part is missing in the manuscript. The source of sweet basil seedlings (is it a cultivar or not) should be clarified. The plot size and the plant densities are also not clear. The conclusion part is too short.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The statistical analysis should be reviewed. For example in Table 2 leaf area index of 60 Dat can not be 502.82. A Duncan ranking is necessary for this research as it will facilitate the understanding of the prominent treatments. In the control treatment the variables are changing (for example in plant height 30 dat 23,62-120 Dat 73,62)?? Isn't the control means without treatment, if yes, how this can happen?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The number of References are OK, but they should be updated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some grammar mistakes but they can be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>From the 'plant spread North – South (cm)', I think the author tried to mean the canopy with? The discussion part and the conclusion needs to be elaborated. Just morphologic observations were recorded, the chemical compositions of the plants (for the each treatments) could be conducted, which will make the research more meaningful.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Reyhan Bahtiyarca
Department, University & Country	Central Research Institute of Field Crops, Türkiye