



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10479
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Some Growth Retardants on Vegetative Growth, Spurs And Fruiting Of “Le-Conte” Pear Trees Under Two types of soil
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	A major revision is needed before the manuscript is acceptable for publication. Manuscript is poorly written. Many typographical errors are present in the manuscript. English usage and grammar is very poor. However, the results of the study are interesting and will be of interest to the readers. I would suggest the authors to seek for help to further improve the manuscript (especially in terms of English).	Thank you for your patience and cooperation to revised my paper and I am interested to your notes. I had done all the corrected as possible as.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		