

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_124370
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of different stem cutting to IBA on sprouting and survival of Night-blooming jasmine (<i>Cestrum nocturnum</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Author has done work on effect of different hormones on the cuttings of <i>Cestrum nocturnum</i> L. which is good work. The result of the work definitely would be going to help scientific community for further research on the species. As author mentioned the species is less explored and has very good potential for commercial and landscaping purpose the study definitely would be useful.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is fine. Can be little simplified if author thinks fine like Effect of IBA on sprouting and survival of stem cuttings of Night-blooming Jasmine (<i>Cestrum nocturnum</i> L.)</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Author needs to check result values described against each parameter seems to be unmatching with the table 1 and 2. 6th line of abstract use another word for early days, which is not representing proper meaning of the sentence. Similarly, Author mentioned C1 required least days for first sprout, then it is not clear if author wants to say that minimum days for highest sprouting was also recorded in C1 which is 32.07 days, but author mentioned 29.22 days. (Needs to check properly) Author need to check with lo also, sentence can be reframed like lo recorded minimum days for first sprout (6.11) as well as least days for highest sprouting (29.22) when compared to other treatments. Similarly, with C₁lo combination, value mentioned in text is 29.22 whereas in table 1 it is 26.67. Author needs to check results properly and should mention the values correctly. Conclusion needs to be written in abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The work done by the author is good, but the results mentioned by the author in the text and in the table are mismatching, which is very confusing. If author wants to publish the article, he or she should check the manuscript properly and do the necessary corrections. In Introduction, author needs to support the text with the references, for e.g. line 6, stating the volatile oil plays major role as mosquito repellent...give reference. Material and methods seem fine, small grammar mistakes needs to be rectified. Reference number 7 mentioned in the section is reference 6 in the bibliography. Result and discussion section, para 2 in types of cutting, mention C3 values. The minimum days for highest sprouting were mentioned as 29.22 (C1) in text, whereas it is 32.07 days in table 1. Author needs to write scientific names for all the reference species given to support the results. Sub heading IBA concentration, second line reframe the sentence, it is confusing. Interaction effect, least days 29.67 mentioned for highest sprouting in C₁lo, table value is 26.67. give scientific name for reference species. Types of stem cutting, check lowest sprouting value, author mentioned 73.07 which is no where in table 2. The lowest value according to table is 75.47 which was recorded in C1 and not in C2. Which is at par with C2 with value of 75.97, In survival percentage, mention values of C1. IBA concentration, author mentioned 84 5 for both I1 and I2, whereas I2 has different value of 85.33. lowest sprouting mentioned as 58.67 % but it is 61.89 in table 2. In discussion part, reframe last sentence, Kaur 2017 is repeated. Interaction effect, check lowest sprouting value it should be 60 %, but it is given 57.33 percent. 3rd paragraph, C3C1 mentioned need to be corrected. Give scientific name for Peach and Jasmine</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are latest but author should include more references if possible.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is fine but the text is very confusing. Author need to reframe few sentences.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Author needs to seriously check the result values. 90 % of the results values in text are not matching the table values, which is very confusion. Author should check the manuscript properly and thoroughly and should do the corrections then only the manuscript can be published	

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:	Mhaiskar Priya Rajendra
Department, University & Country	Forest College and Research Institute, India