



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION 1. In the introduction the author/s should explain what so far have been done for propagation of the species and what are the gaps lacking (ie. extensively justified by literature review). 2. Objectives which warranted this study should be clearly stipulated at the end of the introduction 3. Most updated references should be incorporated in the introduction . MATERIAL AND METHODS 1. If the Experimental design was a randomized complete block design in a split plot arrangement how was it considered in terms of main plot and subplots?. Should indicate what was the main plot and what was the subplot and how may stem cuttings were used. 2. How were the data analyzed for the effect of treatments subjected to the randomized complete block design in a split plot arrangement??. This should be clearly indicated. 2. Should indicate how photoperiod and relative humidity were measured (number of times per day or week)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 1. Results should be separated from the discussion for clarity and each part described properly. 2. On the results the table of ANOVA reflecting treatments for split plot design should be included. Without indicating the table of ANOVA the results may not sound scientifically significant. 3. The title of Table 2 indicating the effect of different cutting type and IBA concentrations on the rooting should be re-written reflecting the Duncan's Multiple Range Test which was used to indicate the differences between the averages.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The species name is incompletely written. It should be written as <i>Camellia sinensis</i> (L.) Kuntze. 2. The abstract is too short. Improve the abstract by indicating the main results obtained. eg. what significant results in terms of rooting percentage, root length and root diameter were obtained. 3. All “Anonymous” references should be removed from the text and replaced with new and most updated references (There a lot most updated references with regard to propagation of tea). 4. Discussion should be re-written with reflection of the most update findings, how do your results correlate of differ, what significant insight has this study contributed?. 5. Conclusion should be properly re written elaborating the major findings of this study.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In reference part, references should be updated with the most updated references.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ezekiel Amri
Department, University & Country	Department of Science and Laboratory Technology, Dar es Salaam Institute of Technology, Tanzania