

Review Form 1.6

Ms JEAI 83977

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_83977
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of IBA and NAA on rooting of stem cutting in dragon fruit [<i>Hylocereus undatus</i> (Haworth) Britton & Rose].
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

Ms JEAI 83977

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments Number of treatments	<p>Authors stated, in the Abstract, that 9 treatments were analyzed and, in the Material and Methods section that 12 treatments were analyzed</p> <p>Authors stated that IBA 4000 ppm would be the best treatment reported in "Root and Shoot Growth of Dragon Fruit (Hylocereus undatus) Stem Cutting as Influenced by Indole Butyric Acid" T. Seran, A. Thresh Published 2015. In fact that paper reported on IBA 8000 as the treatment producing highest values for the variables analyzed.</p> <p>There are some other similar issues in the manuscript, the Discussion is not properly conducted and in this reason there is lack of novelty in data interpretation/research field revision as well</p> <p>There is very mild data analysis/statistical evaluation of the results.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments "...was recorded in cutting treated..." Keywords	<p>This sentence in the Abstract is lacking sense in that context. Observations of all the treatments had certainly been recorded or registered. If the Authors want to state that a specific treatment produced highest values, that sentence should be re-written. The whole manuscript need some English edition and polishing. There are words with the initials unnecessarily capitalized and spaces lacking between words, scientific names which are not italicized and some other issues</p> <p>Keywords used are all in the manuscript title. Authors should choose another ones in order to have their paper properly indexed. Titles are always indexed and it would be the same words indexed instead of two folds more indexing words to find the paper</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paula Cristina da Silva Angelo
Department, University & Country	Brazil