

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125558
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) grafts cv. Alphonso raised in soilless media in various types of containers
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it addresses sustainable agriculture challenges in the Konkan region, particularly concerning the Alphonso mango. It investigates the use of discarded plastic water bottles as root trainers to improve seedling propagation, overcoming issues with spiraled and deformed root systems in traditional polybags. The research conducted at the College of Horticulture in Dapoli shows that grafts raised in transparent bottles with a soilless media achieved better growth and survival rates. This study not only enhances knowledge of effective propagation techniques but also promotes eco-friendly practices by repurposing plastic waste, supporting global sustainability goals, and potentially benefiting mango farmers and the horticultural industry.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</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>yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, featuring a well-structured experimental design and comprehensive methodology. It employs a randomized block design with four replications, ensuring statistically valid results. By comparing various treatments, including traditional nursery bags and different plastic bottles, the study effectively assesses mango graft performance. The use of a soilless media made from cocopeat, leaf manure, and vermicompost is justified for its benefits to root development and plant health. The quantitative metrics reported, such as sprouting rates and survival percentages, provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of the alternative propagation method. Additionally, the manuscript addresses the important issue of root deformities in seedlings, enhancing its relevance to the horticultural community. Overall, the rigorous approach and clear results bolster the scientific credibility of the research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Nil</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramakrishnaiah T N
Department, University & Country	M S Ramaiah College of Arts, Science and Commerce, India