

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121373
Title of the Manuscript:	Nursery Evaluation of MR2 mulberry (<i>Morus sinensis</i> L.) raised using Mini clonal technology under different concentrations of IBA and NAA on growth characteristics of apical cuttings
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 study has reported pivotal data on the influence of auxins on the growth and root traits of mulberry var.MR2.The use of mini-clonal technology and various concentrations of IBA and NAA offers valuable insights for improving mulberry propagation, which is crucial for sericulture and related industries. The adopt of the standardized protocols, as presented in this research on mulberry research systems, might potentially help to increase the efficiency and quality of mulberry propagation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the research on the MR2 mulberry variety and the use of mini-clonal technology with specific rooting hormones.	
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 is comprehensive, summarizing the key aspects of the study.It perfectly covered the study is all about, from the experiment's purpose to the methods used and the key results. Everything you need is right there, no tweaks needed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized, making it easy to understand the research process and results	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically strong and technically solid. It uses a well-organized experimental design with proper controls and repetitions. The statistical analysis using ANOVA makes sure the results are dependable. Moreover, the study's findings align with previous research, which adds to the scientific accuracy of the	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering relevant studies that support the manuscript's findings. No additional references are necessary.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's language and English quality are appropriate for academic communication. Making minor grammatical corrections could	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No additional 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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oli Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Sericulture Research & Training Institute, Bangladesh