

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125545
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Application of Chitosan on Growth and Vigour of Mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) grafts Cv. Alphonso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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.	This manuscript represents a valuable contribution to the scientific community by investigating the effects of chitosan soil drenching on the growth performance of mango grafts, an essential aspect of horticultural science. The study elucidates how various concentrations of chitosan can significantly enhance key growth parameters, including graft height, leaf area, and survival rates, thus offering practical insights. Overall, I find this manuscript commendable for its rigorous methodology, well-articulated results, and implications for enhancing mango production, making it a noteworthy addition to the field of horticultural research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title suggested: Effect of Chitosan Soil Drenching on Growth and Vigour of Mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) grafts Cv. Alphonso	
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.	The abstract is well-structured, providing methodology, results. The abstract would benefit from including a clearer statement of the study's objectives and significance of chitosan in enhancing mango graft growth. Additionally, summarizing key findings with specific results and implications for horticultural practices would enhance its comprehensiveness. Abstract should begin with a general statement about the importance of chitosan for Mango, then move on to the specific context of the study, the experiment conducted, and finally the results and conclusions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, as they follow a logical flow from the introduction through methodology, results, and discussion.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous experimental design and adherence to established methodologies. The use of appropriate design enhances the reliability of the results, allowing for valid statistical analysis. The detailed examination of growth parameters such as graft height, leaf area, and survival percentage provides comprehensive insights into the effects of chitosan on mango grafts. The manuscript effectively correlates its findings with existing literature, reinforcing the validity of its conclusions and highlighting the practical implications for horticultural practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and recent, reflecting relevant studies in the field. However, it is recommended that the authors revise and arrange them according to the specific guidelines of the journal to ensure consistency and proper formatting. Additionally, if there are any key studies or recent advancements related to chitosan's effects on plant growth that have not been included, the authors might consider integrating those to enhance the manuscript's comprehensiveness.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript employs appropriate scientific terminology and presents ideas clearly and coherently. However, some minor grammatical and stylistic adjustments, such as italicizing scientific names, <i>et al</i> and using subscript formatting for T1 (e.g., T<sub>1</sub>), could enhance the overall readability and professionalism of the text. Overall, with these revisions, the manuscript would be more polished and aligned with academic standards.</b>	
Optional/General comments	<b>In the introduction, it would be beneficial to state that, in light of the aforementioned points, this study has been formulated to address the identified problem. Additionally, the conclusion should consider incorporating a brief statement regarding the implications of the findings for agricultural practices or potential directions for future research.</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>C. Bharaani Sri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</b>