

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_124688
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of different bougainvillea varieties to cutting propagation
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 holds considerable importance for the scientific community, particularly those involved in horticulture and plant propagation. The investigation into the response of different Bougainvillea varieties to various types of cuttings provides valuable insights into optimizing propagation techniques, which could enhance both the efficiency and effectiveness of commercial and ornamental plant production. I appreciate the thoroughness of the study, especially the detailed comparison of survival rates, shoot, and root parameters across different cutting types. However, while the study presents valuable findings, further multi-location trials could strengthen its recommendations and validate its broader application to nursery practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript, "Response of Different Bougainvillea Varieties to Cutting Propagation," is quite appropriate as it clearly reflects the core focus of the study. The title conveys the investigation into how various Bougainvillea varieties respond to different propagation techniques, which is central to the research.	
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 of the manuscript is comprehensive as it adequately outlines the core elements of the study, including the experimental design, factors considered (varieties of Bougainvillea and types of cuttings), and key findings related to survival and growth parameters. However, some points can be improved for clarity and depth: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addition of Specific Results: The abstract could benefit from adding specific survival percentages and growth parameter results for clarity, as these quantitative outcomes are central to the study's findings. 2. Conclusion: The abstract should end with a brief conclusion that highlights the practical implications of the study for horticulturists or nursery practitioners, emphasizing how the results can improve propagation techniques. These adjustments will enhance the readability and impact of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript, "Response of Different Bougainvillea Varieties to Cutting Propagation," are generally appropriate and follow a logical flow. The sections include an introduction, material and methods, results, and discussion, which align with standard scientific reporting formats. The content is well-organized to reflect the experimental design, data collection, and outcomes in a clear manner.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates strong scientific correctness through its well-designed experimental framework and rigorous methodology. The factorial randomized block design with appropriate replications ensures reliable and unbiased results, while the selection of multiple Bougainvillea varieties and cutting types provides comprehensive insights into propagation efficacy. The use of statistical analyses, such as analysis of variance, to interpret survival rates and growth parameters adds robustness to the findings. Additionally, the clear presentation of data through well-organized tables and figures, coupled with thoughtful discussion of the results in the context of existing literature, underscores the technical soundness and relevance of the study. Overall, the manuscript effectively addresses its research objectives, providing valuable contributions to horticultural propagation practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references listed in the manuscript are relatively recent and relevant to the topic, covering the period from 1971 to 2023. These references include studies on the propagation of Bougainvillea and other plants, focusing on aspects such as rooting behaviour, influence of growth regulators, and vegetative propagation techniques. However, the majority of references are somewhat dated or only tangentially related to the specific focus on different Bougainvillea varieties and cutting types. To strengthen the manuscript, it is suggested to consider adding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent Reviews: Include recent review articles that provide a broader overview and the 	

Review Form 3

	<p>latest advancements in plant propagation techniques.</p> <p>2. Comparative Studies: References that offer comparative analysis of different propagation methods within Bougainvillea or similar ornamental plants would enrich the context.</p> <p>Incorporating these types of references could enhance the manuscript's depth and provide a more robust theoretical foundation for the study.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication. The overall flow is coherent, and the technical vocabulary is appropriate for the subject matter. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could benefit from revision to improve clarity and readability. Additionally, a few sentences could be more concise to enhance the flow of the manuscript. Despite these minor issues, the manuscript maintains a professional tone suitable for an academic reader.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>NA</p>	

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>
<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:

Name:	Vikas Sharma
Department, University & Country	Swami Keshwanand Rajasthan Agricultural University, India