

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_124238
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of growth substances on rhizogenesis of stem cuttings in pointed gourd ( <i>Trichosanthes dioica</i> Roxb.)
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is very important for the scientific community as it discusses critically, the influence of growth regulators IBA, NAA and salicylic acid with different concentrations on rooting of stem cuttings in pointed gourd ( <i>Trichosanthes spp</i> ). <i>With a standpoint discovery that</i> endogenous auxins that reach the cambial were insufficient to initiate rooting primordia in pointed gourd cuttings and that external application of IBA 150 ppm seems to work best when combined with endogenous auxins to produce a larger number of roots. This is an important aspect of plant physiology	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	YES. Though replacing Growth Substances with Growth Regulators would be more suitable	
<b>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.</b>	<b>YES. However the first sentence has a grammatical error</b> An experiment was <b>to</b> conducted to know the influence of growth regulators The word 'to' should be expunged.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it considered a major aspect of plant physiology. Plant growth regulators are a necessary part of stem and root growth of plant species in general and <i>Trichosantes dioica</i> in particular. Detailed recordings of significant parts were carefully taken with suitable factorial combinations.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>The references are not recent at all considering the fact that the experiment was carried out in recent years "2023-2024"</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	YES	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Some old citations should really be replaced	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Onwe, Eucharia Nnenna</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Evangel University Akaeze Ebonyi State, Nigeria</b>