

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119315
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different concentrations of IBA on rooting and growth factors in apical shoot cuttings of <i>Callistemon lanceolatus</i> under polytunnel condition
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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>1. Yes, it is important and seems to be one of the few reports on the plant studied</p> <p>2. Title is suitable but suggest modification to reflect "Impact of Various IBA concentrations on Rooting and Growth in Apical Shoot Cuttings of <i>Callistemon lanceolatus</i> (Sm.) Sweet in Poly tunnel Conditions"</p> <p>3. The abstract should be rewritten, and suggestions are stated in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes, but minor corrections are stated in the manuscript</p> <p>7. Methods used to determine sprouting percent need to be clearly stated though.</p> <p>8. Conclusion is missing in the manuscript, and this should be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, with minor corrections to be made</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The report seems to be a first and the robustness and importance of the research not well highlighted.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Erute M. Adongbede
Department, University & Country	University of Lagos, Nigeria and NCA&T State University, USA