



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_46932
Title of the Manuscript:	MASSIVE IN VITRO CLONING OF SANDALWOOD (SANTALUM ALBUM LINN.) USING CULTURED NODAL SEGMENTS
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>A good empirical research paper fit for publication by CJAST.</p> <p>However the ideas have been poorly articulated. Even the abstract is not comprehensible. The paper needs to be given to someone with a good command of the English language, so that he/she could read through the paper, correct all the language errors and render it more articulate.</p> <p>Secondly, the work should be divided into sub-sections to ease comprehension. Materials and methods should be sub-divided into data collection and data analysis. Results and Discussion should equally be sub-divided into different sub-sections following the objectives of the study, and not just written globally.</p> <p>Thirdly, the author(s) of the paper should sought for and cite the most recent papers (2012 to 2019) that fall in line with the subject matter of the study. Most of the papers cited in the paper date back to the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s which is not good for a paper that will probably be published in early 2019.</p> <p>Last but not the least, a conclusion should be provided for the paper.</p>	<p>Modified. Abstract and Language improved.</p> <p>Subdivided into sections.</p> <p>New references added.</p> <p>Conclusion added.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good paper fit for publication. However the comments highlighted above should be imperatively integrated before the paper is considered for publication.	Integrated

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No