

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125423
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth responses of castor to application of selected growth retardants
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article focused on very common problem face all castor grower, that is the much higher of castor stalks tall and fastness of growth without benefits to attain. The plant growth regulator proved ability to stop the huge and quickly plant shoot growth and give such advantages as more yield of capsules and leaf area and spike and node length.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title described the issue very well	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes the abstract come in clear subject and object	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article structure was simple and concentrate and very well written	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The correction was very few (in the first line of the materials and methods there is 'at the' repeated twice). Noticed that mistakes are highlighted in yellow colour	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference 'Khan NA, Lone NA, Samiullah. 2000' is exist in reference and not in the article body	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the article English language written well " in my opinion"	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hanan Salah Eldin Taha
Department, University & Country	Egypt