

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124461
Title of the Manuscript:	Influences of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizer on, Growth of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Short 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the combined effects of organic and inorganic fertilizers on garlic growth, providing insights for sustainable agriculture. The findings show that integrating organic inputs like Panchagavya with chemical fertilizers can enhance plant height, leaf number, and chlorophyll content. I appreciate its practical approach strengthen the . Overall, it's a valuable contribution to eco-friendly farming practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Influences of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizer on Growth of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.)," is clear but could be more specific about the study's focus on integrated nutrient management and the use of specific organic inputs like Panchagavya. A more suitable alternative could be: "Effects of Integrated Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth Parameters and	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the experiment, treatments, and key findings. However, it could be improved in terms of clarity and completeness. Here are some suggestions: 1. Clarify Key Results: While the abstract mentions that the 100% inorganic fertilizer and Panchagavya foliar spray were superior, it would be helpful to include more specific results (e.g., percentage improvements or quantitative differences) for better context. 2. Highlight the Importance: The abstract should emphasize why the findings are significant for sustainable agriculture, especially the benefits of reducing chemical fertilizer use through organic inputs. 3. Methodology Details: Consider reducing the level of detail about experimental design (e.g., treatments and replication) in the abstract. Focus more on results and implications, as this level of detail fits better in the methodology section. 4. Remove Redundancy: The abstract could be shortened by eliminating repeated mentions of specific measurements (e.g., "at 60 and 90 days") unless they are essential for understanding the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate but could benefit from some adjustments to improve clarity and flow. Here are some suggestions: 1. Introduction: The introduction provides a solid background on garlic cultivation and the importance of nutrient management. However, it could be more concise, with a clearer transition to the research question or hypothesis. 2. Materials and Methods: This section is well-detailed, but consider organizing it into clearer subsections (e.g., Experimental Design, Treatments, Data Collection Methods) to improve readability. Some details about statistical analysis could also be added for completeness. 3. Results and Discussion: The results are presented in an organized manner, but separating the Results and Discussion into distinct sections would help. Right now, the discussion is integrated into the results, which can make it harder to distinguish the actual data from the interpretation. 4. Conclusion: The conclusion should be more clearly defined as its own section, summarizing the key findings, their significance, and potential applications or future research directions. 5. Tables and Figures: Ensure that tables and figures are referenced appropriately within the text and used effectively to support the results. Suggested Structure: • Introduction • Materials and Methods (with subsections) • Results • Discussion	

Review Form 3

<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>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it is based on a well-structured field experiment conducted over two growing seasons, ensuring the results are reliable and not influenced by seasonal variations. The study carefully considers both organic and inorganic nutrient management strategies, providing a comparative analysis of their effects on garlic growth, which is relevant to sustainable agriculture. The experimental design, with multiple treatments and replicates, strengthens the validity of the conclusions drawn. Additionally, the manuscript references established scientific methods for data</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 references in the manuscript are sufficient, but many of them are relatively dated, with some from as far back as 1988 and 2005. To enhance the manuscript's relevance, I suggest including more recent studies on integrated nutrient management, organic farming practices, and sustainable agriculture. Additionally, referencing recent research on the effects of bio-fertilizers and organic foliar sprays like productivity would improve the manuscript's Studies from the last 5–10 years could provide updated insights and improve the scientific rigor of the</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is generally clear, but there are several areas where improvements are needed to ensure it meets the standards for scholarly communication. The manuscript contains grammatical errors, awkward sentence structures, and inconsistent terminology. Enhancing the clarity, coherence, and flow of the text, particularly in the abstract and results sections, would significantly improve readability. Additionally, technical terms should be used consistently, and certain phrases may need rewording to better convey the intended meaning. A thorough proofreading and language editing would be beneficial.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an important topic in agricultural research by evaluating the effects of organic and inorganic fertilizers on garlic growth. The experimental design is solid, and the findings are valuable for enhancing garlic productivity through integrated nutrient management. However, to increase the manuscript's impact, I recommend incorporating more recent references and refining the language for clarity and precision. Additionally, organizing the discussion section more effectively by clearly linking results to conclusions would strengthen the overall coherence of the paper. Overall, the study is scientifically relevant, but some improvements in presentation and analysis are necessary for scholarly communication.</p> <p>I affirm that my evaluation will be conducted with impartiality and integrity, prioritizing the advancement of scientific knowledge and the welfare of the academic community.</p> <p>Suggested Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Materials and Methods (with subsections) • Results • Discussion • Conclusion • References 	

[Review Form 3](#)

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:	Mayur Arun Dongre
Department, University & Country	Shri Shivaji Vidya Prasarak Sanstha's, Late Karmaveer Dr. P. R. Ghogrey Science College, Kavayitri Bahinabai Chaudhari North Maharashtra University, India