

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123367
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of integrated nutrient management on soil nutrient status and yield in garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	Study on Integrated nutrient management effect on garlic crop is a good approach to understand the chemical properties and status of soil to increase the yield of the crop. Though effect of organic manures and biofertilizers cannot be predicted on the short-term basis (here only two season). Significant result showing the effect of components of natural farming will contribute to define the idea in the scientific field of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is suitable.	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive and clearly defined.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure are appropriate.	
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.	Yield is increases significantly which is showing positive correlation of the treatments. But in the discussion part some points and justification should be added. Specially in the potassium effect, some more explanation is needed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. But additional reference can be added in the result and discussion part.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of language is good and well defined.	
Optional/General comments	Further study can be done.	

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:	Manasij Das
Department, University & Country	Seacom Skills University, India