

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125809
Title of the Manuscript:	Macropropagation of Red Banana
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>The text presents an interesting contribution by exploring an alternative method for propagating Red Banana, a significant dessert cultivar in certain regions of India. The study offers insights into macropropagation, an economical technique that requires less skill compared to micropropagation, making it accessible to small traditional farmers. This aspect is a strong point of the work, as it promotes the inclusion of farmers with limited resources. However, there is a lack of information on the long-term economic viability and scalability of the proposed method, which would be relevant for large-scale adoption.</p> <p>Another point is that although average results are reported, it would be scientifically crucial to include additional statistical analyses, such as significance tests, to provide a more robust understanding of the consistency and reliability of the data. Additionally, the inclusion of graphs could facilitate the interpretation of the results and highlight trends or discrepancies more clearly. This approach could strengthen the validity of the conclusions and offer a more comprehensive view of the impact of the treatments tested.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Evaluating the Efficacy of Macropropagation Techniques for Red Banana (put specie) Using Biocontrol Agents</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>Add: Mention of the statistical methods used to analyze the data. Explicit statement of the primary objective. Brief mention of the comparative performance of other treatments. Practical implications of the findings.</p> <p>Delete: Redundant phrases to make the abstract more concise.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Suggested Structure for Improvement:</p> <p>Keywords: Including a keywords section after the abstract can help in indexing and improve the visibility of the article.</p> <p>Conclusion: Adding a conclusion section can provide a concise summary of the findings and their implications.</p> <p>Visual: Incorporate more graphs, charts, and tables to visually represent the data and make the results easier to interpret.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis: Ensure that the statistical methods are clearly described in the Material and Methods section and that the results include significance levels (p-values).</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound to a certain extent due to its comprehensive experimental design and adherence to standardized protocols established by institutions like the NRCB. The use of a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with multiple replications ensures that the results are statistically valid and reproducible. Additionally, the inclusion of various treatments with detailed descriptions of the growing media and biocontrol agents demonstrates a thorough approach to investigating the research question.</p> <p>However, to enhance its scientific rigor, the manuscript should include more detailed statistical analyses, such as significance testing, to better validate its findings. Overall, the methodological rigor and clear presentation of results contribute adequately to the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be comprehensive and relevant to the study. They cover a range of topics related to banana propagation, growing media, and biocontrol agents, and include both recent and foundational studies. However, to ensure the manuscript is up-to-date with the latest research, it may be beneficial to include a few more references</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <p>Abdalla, Neama, Hassan El-Ramady, Mayada K., Seliem, Mohammed E., El-Mahrouk, Naglaa Taha, Yousry Bayoumi, Tarek A., Shalaby, and Judit Dobránszki. (2022). "An Academic and Technical Overview on Plant Micropropagation Challenges." Horticulturae, 8(8): 677. https://doi.org/10.3390/horticulturae8080677</p> <p>Perez-Montano, F., Alías-Villegas, C., Bellogín, R. A., del Cerro, P., Espuny, M. R., Jiménez-Guerrero, I., & Ollero, F. J. (2014). "Plant growth promotion in cereal and leguminous agricultural important plants: From microorganism capacities to crop production." Microbiological Research, 169(5-6), 325-336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.09.011</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is written in a clear and concise manner, making it accessible to readers within the scientific community. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance readability and precision. Here are some specific observations and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some sentences can be made more concise without losing meaning. • Avoid redundancy to improve the flow of the text. • Ensure that all technical terms are used correctly and consistently throughout the manuscript. • Minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings can be corrected to improve readability. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While the manuscript employs a comprehensive experimental design and uses a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with multiple replications, it lacks detailed statistical analyses. The inclusion of significance testing (p-values) and confidence intervals would provide a more robust validation. Enhanced statistical analysis would strengthen the reliability and reproducibility of the results, offering a clearer understanding of the differences among treatments.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Stefeson Bezerra de Melo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidade Federal Rural do Semi, Brasil</p>