



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	<i>The manuscript "Effect of Some Growth Retardants on Vegetative Growth, Spurs and Fruiting of "Le-Conte" Pear Trees under Two types of soil" addresses the use of growth retardants to vegetative growth, spurs and fruiting that fits to the scope of the journal and represents important data. Although the goals of the study are clear, but there are many major revision. It should be noted that the manuscript was so confusing in terms of vocabularies. Any way, I make some comments to authors. I propose to read carefully comments and revise accordingly. Also, the manuscript needs to minor review on rare English writing. English of ms should be significantly improved.</i>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Detailed Comments: The manuscript "Effect of Some Growth Retardants on Vegetative Growth, Spurs and Fruiting of "Le-Conte" Pear Trees under Two types of soil" addresses the use of growth retardants to vegetative growth, spurs and fruiting that fits to the scope of the journal and represents important data. Although the goals of the study are clear, but there are many major revision. It should be noted that the manuscript was so confusing in terms of vocabularies. Any way, I make some comments to authors. I propose to read carefully comments and revise accordingly. Also, the manuscript needs to minor review on rare English writing. English of ms should be significantly improved. Title The <i>TITLE</i> is sensible but please delete the under two types	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of soil from it. ABSTRACT The <i>ABSTRACT</i> is not informative and do not represents data and conclusions, written in the text, it is too general. I propose add some data. P1, Line 2: under two types of soil instead of sand soil (at Kaffer dawood village in El-Sadat city) and clay soil (at darwa village) conditions P1, Line 5: delete the space: ---- the treatments were P1, Line 7: delete the third spraying was P1, Line 8: add and between fruit quality and vegetative growth P1 Line 9: star sentence with: results showed that ... P1 Line 13: It's better remove the 5% from keywords P1 Line 13: delete the comma before fruit quality and vegetative growth INTRODUCTION I propose to start the <i>INTRODUCTION</i> with the importance of reduction of vegetative growth and improving of fruiting. Then replace the second paragraph: Plant growth retardants ... with the first paragraph: Most of the available ... P1 Line 24: I can't see the Abolfazl et al., 2013 in the references? Please correct it. P1 Line 25: bring the sentence, 'Paclobutrazol uptake is slow, probably due to adsorption and desorption reactions between the chemical and organic matter in the media' after the most of the available ... paragraph. References aren't the same in the text, for example: (Simonyi 2013), (Rademacher, 2000), (Jessica Lynn.2008), (Boy et al.2006), (Christian et al.,2007), ... Please revise them in the whole text according to the Journal's format. P2 Line 3: as one ... P2 Line 6: delete the space: ETC) . The ...	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P2 Line 14: whose replace with which P2 Line 15: add “the” before Le-Conte, for example: of the Le-Conte pear trees. Please correct it in the whole text. MATERIAL AND METHODS P2Line19: ‘5-years’ instead of ‘5 years’ P2Line19: ‘(<i>Pyrus Commuins</i>.L)’ correct with ‘(<i>Pyrus Commuins</i> L.)’ P2 Line 20: delete the space: rootstock . (rootstock.) P2 Line 29 and 30: It’s better to write Paclobutrazol not Cultar (Paclobutrazol) P2 Line 31 and 32: ‘Mepiquat chloride (5%)’ instead of ‘Mepiquat chloride5% (Mepiquat chloride5%)’ Also use a same format form for writing ppm in the whole text. For example use 200ppm not 250 ppm. I mean add a space. P2 Line 33 and 34: remove abbreviation (SA). Delete the mark (–) from titles like: Vegetative Growth Measurements P3 Line 3: 10 mature leaves from 5-7 nodes P3 Line 14: N and C P3 Line 19: correct the reference format: Yadava,1986 P3 Line 26: ‘Average fruit weight’ instead of ‘Average weight of fruit’ and ‘g’ instead of ‘gm’ P3 Line 27: ml³ or cm³? P3 Line 30: add the used abbreviation at the first time (W/V ratio & L/D ratio). W? V? L? D? P3 Line 34: TSS P3 Line 34: bring B in the next sentence P3 Line 37: add title: Data analysis RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS P4 Line 6: It was found that lowest values were obtained from spraying with Mepiquat chloride 5%, followed by	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Paclobutrazol and Succinic acid. Correct Mepiquat chloride 5% in the whole text. There is a space between chloride and 5%. Correct it in the whole text. P4 Line 22: according to the Table 1 P5 Table 1: 'Means separated within column using LSD test at $P \leq 0.05$; Means followed by the same letter were not significantly different' instead of 'Means within each column followed by the same letter(s) are not significantly different at 5% level'. Please correct it for all the tables P6 Line 2: (Table 2) P6 Table 2: bold fruit set section like other sections and do it for all tables. I mean use the same format for inside the tables. Bold it or don't bold it. P7 and P8; justify the sentences P7 Line 2: (Table 2 & Fig.1) P7 Fig.1: improve the Fig1, also for all the figures. P10 table 3: (g) not (g.) P10: (Table 3) not (Table, 3) P11: (Table 4) not (Table, 4) P 13: (Table 5) not (Table, 5) or (Table. 5) P14: use point at the end of sentence (Chen et al., 2012). P14: TSS P14: Bring the <i>CONCLUSION</i> after the Table 5. REFERENCES First justify the <i>REFERENCES</i>. Then check the references again and use a same format form. There are many problems.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roghayeh Najafzadeh
Department, University & Country	Department of Horticultural Sciences, Faculty of agriculture, Tarbiat Modares University (TMU), Tehra, Iran.