

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_111586
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF AUXIN AND GIBBERELLINS HORMONES ON REGENERATION OF PINEAPPLE PROPAGULES FROM CROWN LEAVES (WITH BUDS) IN KILIFI COUNTY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it discusses an important subject that it suggests a solution for a problem that faces the farmers in the study area.</p> <p>Yes, the title is clear and reflects the contents.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The general structure is appropriate. There are some notes and suggestions on the attached file as track change. Yes, mainly after making the suggested corrections.</p> <p>No, I think the author need to add more references to the introduction and to the discussion section that related to auxin and gibberellins function.</p> <p>There are many detailed notes and suggestions in the attached file as track change, the following are general notes: Introduction: there is a need to add a new section about the auxin and gibberellins function related to the subject of the manuscript. And some new studies about the subject. Methodology: The design needs to be clearer, and the experiment layout that presented actually it is not clear and do not show the randomization and the split plot ...etc. There are some variables mentioned in the results but not mentioned in the methodology. Results: The font size in the fig. not clears (not readable). Discussion: In general it needs to be more in depth, also more detailed discussion about the function of tested hormones. The different results needs to be discussed in more detail: what possible causes and what it mean. The discussion is very general and shallow. References: More references (mainly new references) are needed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To add a new section to the introduction about the hormone function (auxin and gibberellin). - The methodology is not clear at all, and the design layout is not clear (do not show the randomization in the blokes and the split plot). There are many notes on the attached file. Root weight and leaves weight not mentioned. The author mentioned two seasons but the months for them is mentioned differently in results and methodology, also why the two seasons?? - The discussion needs more deep discussion about the explanation of the results and its meaning. - The need for more references. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayed Ghaleb Ahed Zakarneh
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Hebron University, Israel