

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_122067</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INFLUENCE OF IBA AND NAA ON ROOTING OF TERMINAL CUTTINGS OF CHRYSANTHEMUM (Dendranthema grandiflora L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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)
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.	The paper discusses the propagation method for flower species. The topic selected is good, but the manuscript needs some corrections although the topic has scientific importance as the species selected is commercially important. The manuscript can be published if some points will be explained clearly and elaborately. Some other authors have also worked on the same species. The author can check their work and do the changes accordingly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine. Some modification can be done like instead of influence effect of IBA and NAA on rooting performance of terminal cuttings of Chrysanthemum is more correct.	
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 seems small. In the abstract, only IBA results are mentioned. The author used other hormones, but the results got in other combination did not mention. Author did not conclude the abstract. The year of study also did not mention in the abstract. The author should mention the combinations used and if different seasons has any effect on the rooting	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In the structure, abstract needs some additions. Introduction need to be written again. Methodology need to be rewritten, results and discussion should include more references, conclusion part needs to be included similarly acknowledgement if any	
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.	Introduction can be written more clearly, results of the present study are included in the introduction part which should be corrected. What was the research problem and what objectives were set for the study should be included in the introduction part. References should be given at proper places. small mistakes like italics should be corrected. Same with methodology and results section. Methodology potting mixture or media needs to mention correctly. Whether used sand or cocopeat or the combination, is not clear. The tool used for analysis should be mentioned. How many cuttings per replications, proportion of different media. Table 1, no uniformity, @ is mentioned at some places and some places it is not mentioned. Methodology should be written in detail. Results also not clear, some place instead of 800ppm, 400 ppm mentioned. Results need to be supported with latest references, may be some horticulture crops can be mentioned. Use same notation for IBA, italics should be done wherever needed. Conclusion part is not written, which needs to be included. 400 ppm IBA treatment got maximum result, NAA 400 ppm is second highest but the combination of both is showing good at 100 ppm, similarly IBA and NAA both at 400ppm giving at par results so which combination is recommended should be mentioned clearly. In Table 1, control is mentioned as T0, but in Table 1, control is referred by T12	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References are less, they are old. Many scientists have worked on the propagation, which can be refereed. Recent references should be use to support the work. One or two references are missing in the text. One reference is extra in the bibliography. Read and Hoyster 1969 from result section is missing in references. Indian horticulture database 2006 is extra. Reference of 1940 is of no significance in today's science. Recent research work needs to be quoted. Same style is not followed for writing reference similarly it is not in alphabetical order.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English can be improved, Scientific name need to be written in italics, et al italics,	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Outcome of the research needs to be written more scientifically Follow same style of writing Include sufficient references Statistical tool used to be mentioned	

### **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>Mhaiskar Priya Rajendra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Forest College and Research Institute, India</b>