

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_123479</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of Different Potting Media on Growth and Rooting Parameters of Bougainvillea (Bougainvillea spp.) Cuttings</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Paper</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Generally, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly in horticulture and plant propagation research.</p> <p>The investigation of the impact of different potting media on the growth and rooting of <i>Bougainvillea</i> cuttings offers valuable insights into optimising propagation methods, which can be beneficial for commercial growers and landscape architects.</p> <p>The results provide a practical framework to improve plant survival rates and growth performance.</p> <p>The manuscript's experimental design is appreciative.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title of the manuscript, "<i>Response of Different Potting Media on Growth and Rooting Parameters of Bougainvillea (Bougainvillea spp.) Cuttings</i>," is quite specific reflecting the core focus of the study.</p> <p>However, a slightly refined version could improve clarity and readability. It could be better modified as follows:</p> <p><i>"Effect of Various Potting Media on the Growth and Root Development of Bougainvillea Cuttings"</i>.</p> <p>This title simplifies the wording and emphasizes the relationship between variables.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a clear and concise overview of research objective, experimental design, and outcomes. However, it can be improved by adding a few critical points and clarifying certain aspects for better comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Objective clarity:</b> The abstract should briefly mention the importance or motivation behind the study. Why is optimizing potting media for <i>Bougainvillea</i> cuttings significant?</li> </ol> <p>Suggested addition: "<i>The study aims to enhance the propagation efficiency of Bougainvillea, a popular ornamental plant, by evaluating the effects of different potting media on its growth and root development.</i>"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Experimental setup:</b> While the treatment details are provided, the abstract could mention the type of cuttings used or the duration of the experiment for better context.</li> </ol> <p>Suggested addition: "<i>The experiment was conducted over 180 days using Bougainvillea hardwood cuttings and was arranged in a Randomized Block Design (RBD).</i>"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Results:</b> The results are well-stated but could be framed more impactfully by summarizing the general outcome first, before diving into the specifics. Also, including the significance of findings could strengthen the conclusion.</li> </ol> <p>Suggested addition: "<i>The study revealed that a mixture of soil, sand, FYM, and vermicompost significantly improved plant height, root weight, and survival rate compared to other treatments, highlighting its potential as an optimal potting medium for Bougainvillea propagation.</i>"</p> <p><b>Deletion:</b> The detail of specific numerical results may be a bit too detailed. It would be better to summarize these results briefly and reserve the specific numbers for the results section.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript generally follows a standard format that is appropriate for a scientific research paper. However, following are the areas where the structure could be improved for better readability and flow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Introduction:</b> This section is appropriate, but it could benefit from more emphasis on the relevance of the study, particularly any gaps in existing research related to potting media in <i>Bougainvillea</i>. Expanding on this would better justify the need for the study.</li> <li><b>Materials and Methods:</b> This section is well-explained, but mentioning some important environmental factors would add value, such as if the experiment was conducted in natural environment what was the photoperiod or temperature (if possible)?</li> <li><b>Results and Discussion:</b> This section is combined, which is acceptable, but separating "Results" and "Discussion" would allow the manuscript to present the findings first and then interpret them in a distinct discussion. This can help make the interpretation and implications clearer.</li> <li><b>Conclusion:</b> This section is appropriate, though it could be expanded to include more on the broader implications of the findings beyond the specific experiment, such as potential applications in different regions or for other plant species.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust since it follows a well-defined experimental design using a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with appropriate replications.</p> <p>Results are based on carefully measured growth and rooting parameters, making the conclusions data-driven and evidence-based.</p> <p>The relevant statistical analysis (e.g., F-tests, standard errors, and critical differences) is conducted,</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	ensuring a scientifically valid comparison among treatments. However, inserting exact p-values instead of writing 'SIG' in the tables and adding significance statements in results description would enable the readers to better assess the strength of the findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references include a mix of both recent and older sources. The inclusion of older references may be justified for foundational statistical methods, but for a study focused on potting media and plant growth, the majority of references should ideally be more recent to reflect current advances in the field.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The writing is direct and conveys the main points effectively, but some sentences can be restructured for greater clarity, readability, and academic tone. A detailed proofreading for grammar, sentence structure, and formal expression is recommended.  Some informal language can be replaced with more formal academic terminology such as, instead of " <i>the plants get shock</i> ," use " <i>the plants experience transplant shock</i> ".	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A more refined version of the manuscript would be of great interest to the journal readership. Moreover, adding visual proofs/images of the growth performance (if possible) would provide a solid evidence of research originality.	

**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)
<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>Ishrat Fatima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Pakistan</b>