

Review Form 3

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a detailed evaluation of how different concentrations of IBA and NAA influence rooting in Chrysanthemum terminal cuttings. The findings contribute valuable insights into optimizing propagation techniques for this economically important flowering plant. The well-documented effects of IBA, particularly at 400 ppm, on various rooting parameters offer practical guidelines for horticulturists. I appreciate this manuscript for its clear experimental design, thorough analysis, and practical implications for improving chrysanthemum propagation efficiency.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It clearly conveys the focus on the influence of IBA and NAA on rooting terminal cuttings of Chrysanthemum, specifying the plant species and the growth regulators studied. This specificity helps readers quickly understand the scope and relevance of the research.</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>The abstract is somewhat comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the research objectives, methods, and key findings, specifically detailing the effects of IBA and NAA on various rooting parameters.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized with a clear flow from introduction to methods, results, and discussion. Each section is distinct and logically follows the previous one, aiding in the clarity and coherence of the research presentation.</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 due to its well-structured experimental design and rigorous methodology. The use of a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) and detailed statistical analysis enhances the reliability of the results. The study effectively demonstrates the impact of different concentrations of IBA and NAA on the rooting of chrysanthemum cuttings, supported by comprehensive data and comparisons with previous research. The results align with established findings in plant propagation, underscoring the manuscript's validity and contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript include a mix of both recent and older sources. While some references, like those from 2022 and 2020, are recent and relevant, others date back several decades. For a comprehensive and current perspective, the inclusion of more recent studies could strengthen the manuscript.</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 clear and coherent, with technical terms used appropriately. However, some sentences could benefit from minor grammatical and stylistic adjustments to enhance readability and precision.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nguyen Thi Lang
Department, University & Country	High Agricultural Technology Research Institute, Vietnam