



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10973
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cutting type and IBA on rooting and growth of Citron (<i>Citrus medica</i> L).
Type of the 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	Abstract: paragraph 2 seems unclear. It should be stated that “the result indicated that the medial cutting parts with 500 and 1000ppm perform better in terms of..... as compared to control treatment. Implication/some concluding remarks of the result should also been stated in the abstract. Last paragraph: the figure given is inconsistent(93.33%). The medial type cutting in 500 and 1000ppm IBA rooting percentage is 100% (see table 1). Introduction: Review for some clerical and grammatical errors. Paragraph 1 line 4.... The tree can grow to a size of about 3 meters...(change size to height. diameter of the fruit? Paragraph 2 line 5 seems unclear (please review) Materials and methods: Be optimistic. Concentration of IBA should be in ppm not mg/kg as stated in paragraph 2 line 4. Also T1 (top cutting) it should be tip cutting as mentioned in the abstract and the result of the study. Results and Discussion: review for some clerical error and grammatical error. Be optimistic in your variables. T1 (tip cutting) not tipe cutting. The highest rooting percentage is in 500 and 1000ppm and not in 1000ppm only as mentioned. Be consistent and optimistic, mg/1 ? if you use it then, use it all over the text. But the most appropriate unit is ppm as used by all authorities you have cited in your paper. The type of cutting you stated in the methodology is top, medial and bottom. Therefore, used it all over the text, but top should be changed to tip which is more appropriate. In Table 2 and 3, the word transplants should be changed to shoots. You had	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	measured the shoot length and not transplants since your using stem cuttings. Conclusion: indicate what type of cutting significantly differed with the other type. Its medial type. Your conclusion is meaningless unless you made mentioned of medial type of cutting which performed significantly better with tip and bottom type. It is better if you will infer a concentration of IBA at 500 to 1000ppm would response better in terms of.....	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should be optimistic in using variables... Type of stem cuttings is tip, medial and bottom and therefore, it should be the right variable in your Tables and in your discussion... Do not change this variable in all your discussion. Review your paper for some clerical and grammatical errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	For some reference please visit the link: http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJBC/article-abstract/A99E76D10630	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Onofre S. Corpuz
Department, University & Country	Director for Research and Development, Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Arakan, Philippines