



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_48890
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of IBA for efficient survival of micropropagated <i>Garcinia indica</i> Choisy shoots using In-vitro and Ex-vitro rooting techniques
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>)

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>Good original research paper fit for publication by APRJ. However, some corrections and modifications need to be done on the paper before it can be considered for publication.</p> <p>First and foremost, the geographical coordinates (latitude and longitude) of the area under study should be given in order to permit the reader know where precisely the study was conducted.</p> <p>Secondly, the statistical software used for data analysis should be highlighted and the rationale underlying its use explained. And it is necessary to sub-divide the materials and methods section into: location of study area; data collection procedure; and data analysis procedure.</p> <p>Plausible justifications should be given for the findings of the study. Therefore, the findings should be presented in an analytical and not merely in a descriptive manner in order to give it more weight.</p> <p>Equally, the paper should be properly discussed. The paper's findings should be compared and contrasted with the findings of other authors. The author(s) of the study need to seek for and use more research works (the most recent i.e. 2014 – 2019) of other authors to discuss the findings of the study. This will give the study more weight and scientific rigour.</p> <p>Last but not the least, a better conclusion should be given and the practical and policy implications of the study highlighted. This will go a long way to ease the decision making process of policy makers.</p>	<p>.</p> <p>The geographical coordinates of the village / area along with MSL from where the materials had been collected have been added and highlighted.</p> <p>The statistical method and tools used have been mentioned and highlighted.</p> <p>The justifications have been given and highlighted.</p> <p>The discussion part has been improved and more relevant research reference has been added and highlighted. Around 11/24 references are between 2014-19.</p> <p>The conclusion has been improvised.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Language and syntax errors should be looked into.	The language and syntax errors have been looked upon.
Optional/General comments	Good original research paper fit for publication by APRJ. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be looked into before the paper is considered for publication.	Thank you, The necessary corrections throughout the manuscript have been made and highlighted



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	No ethical issues