



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17970
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Study of Organically Produced Mint (<i>Mentha piperita</i>) in the Republic of Macedonia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Materials and methods need more detail about the soil properties and climate conditions to follow the objectives. - The experiment lost the control treatments that necessary to the scientific publication. - An author needs to add more ideas and related research in the part of discussion. - The conclusion was not link to the objective.	The new version of the paper took into consideration editors point of view. I do believe this format covers editors requests. You're kindly invited to have look in the new one.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is interest issues that are essential to human health and environment.	