

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 manuscript deals with a very pertinent problem of crop harvest. Castor is an important oil-yielding plant. Issues during its harvest are significant, so research is required to manage high yields with less biomass. This would help ease harvest with less vegetative tissue.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Positive effects of growth retardants on Castor (<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.)	
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.	The abstract should include the aim of the study undertaken, a brief design, the outcome of the work and a conclusion. It should be to the point.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Full forms of abbreviations should be included in the text.	
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 line of experimentation is correct. However, to make it more robust the following should be included as a part of the revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of replicates should be mentioned. • Statistical analysis should be included and also represented in the graphs. • The sowing period and the temperature conditions should be mentioned. • A few photographs of control and growth retardant treated plants can be added in the manuscript to highlight the significant difference in the control and treated plants 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	A review of the literature is not up to date. The following two papers can be included. Sudha Rani and C Sudhakar Effect of plant growth retardants on growth, yield and economics of kharif pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i> . L) International Journal of Chemical Studies, P-ISSN: 2349–8528 E-ISSN: 2321–4902 IJCS 2018; 6(6): 1495-1498 © 2018 IJCS Received: 15-09-201 Liv S. Severino ^{2*} & Eduarda de Oliveira ³ Plant growth regulators influence the height and biomass partition of castor plants ¹ Brazilian Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Engineering v.28, n.5, e276554, 2024, ISSN 1807-1929	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It would be better if the manuscript was written lucidly. There are ambiguities and grammatical mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I would seek clarification regarding the uniform absorption of the growth regulators sprayed on the plant's surface.• Castor plant is known to tolerate cadmium toxicity and survive well in polluted soils resulting in reduced growth and biomass of the plant. Cadmium is also known to increase the activity of superoxide dismutase and peroxidase. The possibility of reducing vegetative growth can be explored through this route as well.	

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:	Ratnum Kaul Wattal
Department, University & Country	University of Delhi, India