



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4450
Title of the Manuscript:	Rootstocks influence the Growth, Biochemical Contents and Disease Incidence in Thompson seedless Grapevines
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	1. Language is not readable through the whole manuscript. 2. Data analysis method and repetition setting were not provided in the part of MATERIALS AND METHODS. 3. Biochemical analysing methods are too old. 4. How old were the grafted plants for this research? Or when is the current trial conducted? 5. Fruit yield as a very important parameter should have been investigated in this research. 6. Results are too simple and short, authors should give readers more details and calculations. 7. The correlation coefficient analysis is useless in this research and author did not draw any useful findings through this analysis, therefore Table 2 is also useless. 8. The only new finding in this manuscript is that 110 R as rootstock promoted growth, improved disease resistance and increased phenolics content, however authors did not cite relevant references to strengthen this issue in discussion part.	1. The research article has been re written. 2. The data analysis has been explained in the material and method section. 3. The biochemical methods are as per the earlier workers. 4. The experiment was conducted on 8-years old vines. 5. Fruit yield was not correlated. However, only vegetative growth parameters were considered for study. 6. The results are explained with proper justification. 7. The correlation coefficient gives an idea for its relationship with particular parameter which can be taken care if needed. Hence, it cannot be deleted form the article. 8. The rootstock 110-R is new addition and is being considered as an alternative to the present Dog Ridge under Indian condition. The supporting references regarding disease resistance and other parameters have been incorporated in the research article (Please see line no 142-174, 197-230, 235-259).



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	“grafted on” should be “grafted onto”. Also Many language errors.	The corrections as suggested are made in the text. The language errors are cleared.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	According to the Compulsory REVISION comments, this paper lack new insights and even poorly written and I suggest that it can not be acceptable for publication in the journal.	The research paper has its importance considering the problems faced by the grape growers under tropical conditions.