

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_104318</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT ROOT INDUCING AGENTS ON CUTTING PROPAGATION OF TEA (Camellia sinensis)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. Instead of using commercial chemical agents for root induction in vegetative propagation, searching alternate natural agent is appreciable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. The title of the article is suitable</b></p> <p><b>Abstract is not very comprehensive. There are some variations found between the abstract and the full text. For example in completely randomized design, number of cuttings in each replicate is given as 20 in abstract and 10 in methodology.</b></p> <p><b>Sbusections and structure are appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>Though the manuscript is scientifically correct, the results are not explained well and Table no. should be given instead the above table or below table. Similarly, the values of length (cm) and weight (g per shoot or whatever may be) should be mentioned in the title or in the column, as directed in the manuscript. References are not followed as per the Journal's method.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The statistical analysis and interpretations are not comprehensive. It should be clearly stated that whether the value of IBA shows significant difference with other agents or not. Those values are not significantly different with the IBA then those agents can be used as alternately. For each experiment it should be clearly mentioned. The discussion is not satisfactory.</p> <p>Kindly refer the manuscript</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>P. Velayutham</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bharathidasan University, India</b>