Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_130303**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Vegetative propagation of Kusum (Schleichera oleosa(Lour.) Oken) through air layering for the mass multiplication of quality planting stock**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study addresses a significant gap in the vegetative propagation of *Schleichera oleosa* (kusum), an economically valuable species widely used as a host for lac insects. By optimizing air layering techniques, the manuscript provides insights into the mass propagation of elite planting stock, which can enhance lac productivity and germplasm conservation. The findings have practical implications for lac cultivators, researchers, and conservationists, contributing to the socioeconomic development of rural and tribal communities reliant on lac cultivation. The work also serves as a model for improving propagation protocols for other species with similar challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, summarizing the focus on vegetative propagation, air layering, and its application to kusum. It is concise and informative.	
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 provides an overview of the study, including the objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be improved by explicitly mentioning the implications of the findings for lac cultivation and tribal upliftment. Additionally, the survival rate of 32.76% could be contextualized further to highlight areas for future improvement.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with a well-structured methodology and a clear presentation of results. Statistical analysis and discussion of the differential effects of treatments support the conclusions. However, a more detailed discussion on the challenges of low survival rates during hardening and potential solutions could enhance the study's practical relevance.	
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 relevant to the study, covering key aspects of vegetative propagation, lac cultivation, and previous research on air layering. Most references are recent and appropriate for scholarly work. Please recheck the format if using APA 7th citation style.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical issues (e.g., article usage, sentence structure) are present and should be revised for fluency and readability.	
Optional/General comments	Suggestions of improvement: Expand the abstract to include broader implications of the study. Address the challenges and potential solutions for increasing the survival percentage during hardening in the discussion. Conduct a thorough language review to eliminate minor grammatical errors. Provide additional details or visuals, such as charts or photographs, to complement the tabular data and enhance engagement. The manuscript does not raise any apparent ethical concerns. It adheres to accepted research practices and focuses on plant propagation techniques without involving sensitive or controversial elements.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fadhlul Khaliq Bin Ab Patah**
Department, University & Country	**Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia**