

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAERI_122195</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF MOST APPROPRIATE PROPAGATION MEDIA FOR REGENETRAION OF PINEAPPLE SEEDLINGS FROM PINEAPPLE CROWN LEAVES</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**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)
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 is of interest because Pineapple cultivation is the main activity. The authors identify the soil suitable for pineapple cultivation. The authors address the pressing issue of finding the most suitable local propagation means for growing pineapple seedlings from crown leaves, without leaving the farmers' homes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	the title of the article is suitable	
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 must justify the relevance of the study, its goals and objectives, provide the research methodology, and provide more detailed data in the results section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In the article, in the methodology section, it is necessary to describe in detail exactly what methods, qualitative and quantitative, were used to measure the result. If the experiment was repeated 4 times, which of the data was used to calculate the result? Statistical processing of the data should be performed. It is not entirely clear why the study of coconut dust is being conducted if it is expensive. The authors did not initially plan to use it due to its high cost.	
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 is scientifically sound and technically sound as the authors conducted the study in four of the six pineapple growing areas in Magarini District. A randomized experiment with a complete block design was conducted and repeated four times. The authors report the data Number of planted leaf cuttings, germinated and emerged seedlings in coconut dust, Soso soil, Sokoke soil and chitosan propagation media across the four CBO groups.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References provided in the study for 2020-2024, which contains new information. But in my opinion, at least 20 sources should be included.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

[Review Form 3](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mechshanova Anna Gennadijevna</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Manash Kozybayev North Kazakhstan University", Kazakhstan</b>