



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The abstract of this work has been published in the 25th INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC - EXPERTS CONGRESS ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD INDUSTRY, Çeşme-İzmir / TURKEY; 09/2014. The work is limited to a dry matter yield evaluation (Leaves and stems) peppermint in one cultivation condition only in 2 crops. It is also presented a spreadsheet deployment and cultivation costs. Work does not present nor discusses comparisons with other forms of cultivation, or with works of other authors. The paper does not have sufficient contributions to be published as an article.	In accordance to the journal's opinion, for not having ANY conflict I have submitted this paper which had been presented on the metioned Conference. The scientific committee on that Conference did NOT HAVE nor EXPRESSED in way an opinion that the paper content possesses no scientific value. Hope, you'll value the efforts of that scientists who had read the paper and decided it possesses value. If not...so be it. However, a new version of the paper is submitted. You're kindly asked to have a look.
Minor REVISION comments	The work was not verified by the authors after generating the .pdf file, which is misconfigured.	You probably know for the loss of formats during conversion from .docx into .pdf or different formats.
Optional/General comments		