SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_11274**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECTS OF INDOL-3-BURTYRIC ACID (IBA) CONCENTRATIONS AND TYPE OF CUTTING ON ROOTING OF TEA (Camelia sinensis L.)**
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 topic of this paper is certainly of interest and with relevance from basic to practical point of view. However, I have a number of methodological concerns which need to be solved or, at least, be justified. As it stand, the paper is not sufficient for publication. -**Introduction**: is short and not informative enough. Please, lengthen the introduction. *L39-41: - Objectives: this is a weak justification for your paper. You need to provide more evidence - **M&M section**: *L50: Please check again the sentence. *L57: authors did not mention how they determined root quality. - **Results & discussion**: My biggest concern is that the authors do not spend much time discussing some relationship/mechanism between the effect of IBA hormone and/or type of cutting and rooting phenomenon. They do provide a great deal of peripheral information, which is not well integrated into the text. *L71: Figure instead of table *L78: Please check the concentration again (6000ppm).	Revised (according to reviewer's suggestions) manuscript .

	* Table 2: Statistical analysis is missed in root quality parameter. *L93: The sentence should be changed to “Applications of elevated concentration of IBA increased rooting”. *L106: sentences not well integrated into the text. You are off topic. * Authors did not refer to other studies dealing with the same topic. They are not synthesizing the literature out there, and the literature they do review does not merit a research paper. - **Others:** * scientific English and Style: Minor spell check and style are required **Suggestion of reviewer:** Perhaps the whole manuscript needs to be changed and revised. Based on these judgments, I can recommend the manuscript for publication with minor revision.	
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General comments	None	