

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122111
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on growth, yield and quality of Japanese mint (<i>Mentha arvensis</i> L.) var. Kosi”.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This study "Effect of inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on growth, yield and quality of Japanese mint (<i>Mentha arvensis</i> L.) var. Kosi" is an interesting study, however, the study shows some issues that need to be addressed to make the work worthy of consideration for publication in a scientific journal, and they are pointed out below.	
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.	More information may be needed	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate, some sections are missing or omitted	
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.	A more comprehensive literature review to provide a stronger foundation for the study to help contextualise the scientific rationale for this study is needed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Authors should adhere to the journal referencing style.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language may be needed</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This study “Effect of inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on growth, yield and quality of Japanese mint (<i>Mentha arvensis</i> L.) var. Kosi” is an interesting study, however, the study shows some issues that need to be addressed to make the work worthy of consideration for publication in a scientific journal, and they are pointed out below.</p> <p>The aims and objectives/the gap and the rationale in this study are not clearly stated. The study could be improved by including more references to previous research in this area of study. A more comprehensive literature review to provide a stronger foundation for the study and help to contextualise the scientific rationale for this study; with other articles to illustrate that this study has reflected on other studies done before now in this area with more evidence to prove the rationality logically and superiority of the method used.</p> <p>Was the methods originally developed by you? If not, you need to describe it and reference it. How were these highlighted analyses done, what procedures, methods, techniques, analysis, and instrument/equipment were used and references? A brief description of these methods and the choice of methods should be mentioned and then referenced. What are their implications based on the aim/objectives of the study? At this point, it is not clear if the aim/objectives were addressed.</p> <p>Results should be interpreted and discussed.</p> <p>All the results have been stated, however, what is the implication of the results based on the aim/objectives as it reflects on the rationale of the study? It is not enough to state the result, it should be interpreted and discussed with references. At this point, it is not clear if the aim/objectives were addressed. In addition, what is the relevance of the results from the outcome point of the study? What informed your selected study choice? The study could be improved by including more references to previous research in this area of study. A more comprehensive literature review to provide a stronger foundation for the study and help to contextualise the scientific rationale for this study to explain the findings; with other articles to illustrate that this study has reflected on other studies done before now in this area with more evidence to prove the rationality logically and superiority of the method used. Are they in agreement or different, what is the implication of the Effect of inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on the growth, yield and quality of Japanese mint? Then, support your argument/findings with scientifically backed-up references.</p> <p>Further, the authors should add a comparative study with other articles to illustrate that this study has reflected on other studies done before now in this area with more evidence to prove the rationality logically and superiority of the experimental method used, rather than simply listing the results in a Table format only. In addition, a statistical analysis of the results and its interpretation could be clearly explained.</p> <p>The conclusion should reflect what was done, with recommendations/future direction.</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:	Onyedikachi Ubani
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa