



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	The method is not sufficient. The authors must describe the procedure and the experimental schedule clearly. Authors did not use a pot for cutting in this experiment. How did you observe the state of roots and analyze as shown in Table 2. Normally, a pot is employed in research such the manuscript. In Table 2, the data should be expressed as average $\pm$ SD. Table 1 is more discussed if the authors need. The concentration of IBA is high to activate the rooting. The authors should reconsider the experimental procedure.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many careless mistakes (e.g., misspelling, missing letter) in the manuscript. <i>Camelia</i> must be corrected. Check carefully and correct them. References named "Anonymous " should be cited from available source, not the web referred in the manuscript. In Introduction, reference for "Turkish tea clone Fener-3" should be cited.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Though the result may useful in some fields, the manuscript is not scientifically robust and not technically sound.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer