

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121699
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Impact of Copper Sulfate on the In Vitro Propagation of Anthurium (Anthurium andraeanum Lind.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The aesthetic properties of anthurium is highly valued and hence it's faster growth rate is of commercial importance. Due to this, scientific experiments to shorten flowering periods are highly encouraged. This manuscript aims to help anthurium farmers achieve shorter production periods thus maximizing their profits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>Title is suitable</u>	
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.	<u>Abstract is comprehensive</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>yes</u>	
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.	<u>Manuscript is scientifically correct because it the research methods are clearly defined, the objective and aim is clear, and statistical methods are applied in data analysis. The manuscript is also technically sound because it is well organized and written clearly thereby enhancing communication.</u>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<u>References are sufficient though most are not recent</u>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is fit for scholarly communication In experiment 2 (results and discussion), mention publications that have portrayed similar findings on the effects of increasing BA in the medium.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javan Ominde Ogola
Department, University & Country	University of Eldoret, Kenya