



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8542
Title of the Manuscript:	Rooting Response of <i>Rosa canina</i> and <i>Cotoneaster <u>acuminatus</u></i> to Different <i>in vitro</i> Factors
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The abstract should have a opening or introductory sentence describing the importance of the study. It should end with concluding remarks or take home message. 2. Author citation for Cotoneaster acuminatus is missing which is Lindl. 3. Generic names (Rosa and Cotoeaster) should start with initials after first mentioning in full. 4. Discussion needs some improvement. 5. Molallem et al. (2012) is missing in bibliography 6. Check for Sivansan or Sivanesan	I agree with the reviewer in his valuable comments and I highly appreciate his efforts. I almost revised the most of the comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		