



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18194
Title of the Manuscript:	DORMANCY BREAKING OF THE FIG TREE WITH HYDROGEN CYANAMIDE AND GARLIC EXTRATE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 81-83: Please add references for this statement. - Please describe the quadratic regression model in the materials and methods. And how did you evaluate the effectiveness of this model? Please evaluate it based on R^2 or RMSE value by citing the following reference: Chen, Z., Zhu, C. Modelling inactivation by aqueous chlorine dioxide of <i>Dothiorella gregaria</i> Sacc. and <i>Fusarium tricinctum</i> (Corda) Sacc. spores inoculated on fresh chestnut kernel. Letters in Applied Microbiology, 2011, 52:676 – 684. - Please describe your data more statistically in the results when comparing garlic extract and hydrogen cyanamide treatments. $P < 0.05$ or $P > 0.05$? - Please add SD values to all the data in the tables.	Line 81-83 – the reference was put. The authors do not see the need to describe the quadratic models in the figures, in order that the regression models are most commonly used in polynomial regression analysis. Figures placed in the default error tables in the tray and standard error obtained in the evaluated variables. The standard error was given in all the tables and graphs.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. Please add standard error bars to all the data in the figures.	The standard error was given in all the tables and graphs.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		///////