

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122057
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and menthol content of Japanese mint (<i>Mentha arvensis</i> L.) Var. Kosi.
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</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.	The central idea of this work is important. Strong experimental data validates the manuscript, which includes an original contribution. It is demonstrated that the scientific arguments are flawless and are fully backed by current references.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	No You wrote your Keywords, abstract, results, and conclusion poorly. More detailed information about the effects of the tested factors on the produced nanoparticles was lacking. I couldn't find an organizing principle or sufficient justification.	
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.	Because more specific details are available than in past research studies, the reader can completely understand the concept and procedures of the current study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. There are a number of verbs and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest accepting this original work with some major adjustments. The introduction did not address all of the research topic's points, and the reference utilized is somewhat old. The technique's part lacks significant information and factual accuracy with references. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details. The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section but did not discuss each point independently. Which statistical program was utilized in this study? This study employed the oldest references to support its methods, observations, and discussion. If you have any arguments, please provide statistical evidence to support them. The article's content is filled with numerous awkward sentences. The entire text has a lot of verbs and phrases that are repeated. The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date. The authors also disregarded the conventions of good writing style and research methodology. The findings drawn are not sufficiently backed by experimental data, and the conclusions, experimental work, and related discussion are insufficiently in-depth.</p> <p>There wasn't enough specific information available regarding the effects of every aspect that were evaluated. If the authors could provide more data tables, diagrams, and statistics to back up each of your suggested paths of action, according to me, it would be excellent.</p> <p>The discussion that occurred was also utterly pointless and messy. Your discussion section was not written clearly without grammatical or spelling mistakes. The content is a collection of weak phrases, and the presentation is poor.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. There are a number of verbs and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.</p> <p>The manuscript needs to better emphasize the relevance of the research and its practical implications. It is unclear what the authors consider their main contribution to the academic literature and what they envisage in terms of recommendations for further research.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Egypt

Review Form 3