

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_121735</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Different Potting Media on Germination &amp; Growth of Dahiman (<i>Cordia macleodii</i> Hook.) in Nursery</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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>Proper nursery management of Dahiman seedlings is crucial for ensuring high germination rates and healthy seedling development, both of which are essential for the sustainable cultivation of this valuable species. Economically, Dahiman is a highly prized timber species, known for its fine grain, durability, and resistance to pests, making it ideal for high-quality furniture, cabinetry, and construction materials. The wood's premium status in the market contributes to the livelihoods of those involved in its cultivation, harvesting, and processing. Also, it is also known for its pharmacological uses. Thus, management practices that contribute to the cultivation of this species should be properly investigated by the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The article title is suitable enough given the context of the manuscript.</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 concise and comprehensive enough.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I suggest double checking of the formatting guidelines as there are some observed inconsistencies all throughout the manuscript.</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's discussion, graphical and tabular figures need significant change to be statistically correct. It was said in the discussion that there were "significant" differences between treatment means however these differences were not indicated/reflected in both tabular and graphical figures. Superlative letters indicating differences were not found in tabular figure. While error bars were also not reflected in the graphical figures as well. I highly recommend to consult a certified statistician to address this issue of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References cited are sufficient enough.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality could still be improved. Instead of simply describing data results, implication of results could also be stated in the manuscript as well.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Bryan Glomel S. Silverio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Philippines, Philippines</b>