



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44243
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro effect of essential oil of peppermint (Mentha x piperita L.) on the mycelial growth of Alternaria alternata
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>)

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	- The essential oil was pure? Where was it bought? - Put scientific names of the species after common name; - For quantitative data, one should use regression analysis and not mean's test (Tukey, etc.). It is necessary to redo the entire statistical analysis according to polynomial regression analysis. With the derivation of the regression equation one must calculate the physical efficiency and obtain the best response (oil concentration) for each variable analysed; - The results should be rewritten according to the statistical analysis; - Redo the figures in accordance at new statistical analysis; - Discussions should be adapted according to statistical analysis and results; - Conclusions should be adapted according to statistical analysis; - Put scientific names of references in italics - More suggestions are in the review version	- Yes, the essential oil used is pure and was purchased at a local store specializing in natural products; - Scientific names were placed after common names; - All of the study's statistics were redone and as suggested by the reviewer we used the polynomial regression analysis; - The results, discussion and conclusion were rewritten according to the new statistical analysis; - All scientific names in the references were placed in italics; - All other corrections suggested by the reviewer were performed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	