



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_50689
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF STOCK AGE, HORMONE TYPES AND CONCENTRATIONS ON ROOTING AND EARLY GROWTH OF VITELLARIA PARADOXA C.F.GAERTN. STEM CUTTINGS
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>1) Line 9-11: This study investigated..... with the aim of improving on early maturity of the species. But the recorded data (shoot height, shoot diameter, leaf production and leaf area) don't support their objectives?. Because these above parameters are not refer to early maturity.</p> <p>2) Keywords: Growth rt6egulator, change to Growth regulator,</p> <p>3) Some references were not found in their reference list as follow: 3.1 Line 50: Teiklehaimanot <i>et al.</i>, 1996 3.2 Line 59: Kumlay and Eryigit, 2011 3.3 Line 69: Hartmann <i>et al.</i>, 1990 3.4 Line 78: Sanou <i>et al.</i> (2004) 3.5 Line 198: Picasso, 1984</p> <p>4) Authors should specify the coconut fruit age which they used in their work (your=ng fruit or mature fruit).</p> <p>5) Authors should cited their statistical program for analyse the collected data.</p> <p>6) For discussion, authors writing' style are inconsistent with their results.</p> <p>7) Authors should add their discussion as follow 7.1 Why 15 months old cutting showed the higher survival than 9 months old? 7.2 Why the application of NAA at 200 ppm showed the best results in terms of shoot length, shoot diameter, leaf area and leaf production?</p> <p>8) Fig 1.: Authors should fill their alphabets, which showed the statistical differences on bar graph.</p> <p>9) Table 2: Authors should check the accuracy of their alphabets in all column. For example, column of shoot height, 9 months old, NAA at 200 ppm was 4.81±0.06d, while 15 months old, NAA at 200 ppm was 4.71±0.06e. What's right?.</p> <p>10) Line 362: this reference missing page number.</p> <p>11) Line 385: Rhizopora stylosa change to Rhizopora stylosa</p> <p>12) Line 385: this reference missing volume (issue): page number.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Maharakham University, Thailand