



PROPAGATION OF ORNAMENTAL PLANTS

Editorial Office, University of Forestry, 10 Kliment Ohridski blvd.,
Sofia 1756, Bulgaria, Fax: (++ 359 2) 862 28 30, e-mail: ivilievltu@yahoo.com,
www.journal-pop.org

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWERS

Title of the manuscript: ... "EXOGENOUS SPERMINE APPLICATION
ENHANCES....."

Author (s): ...Ali Pourkhaloe and Khosh-
Khui.....

No of the manuscript:JPOP 615.....

Deadline for the receiving of your review: 30 days after the receiving of the
manuscript

**Please consider main points A and B. Please DO NOT CONTINUE TO
REVIEW the manuscript if:**

- the answer to point A.1 is NO**
- the answer to point A.2 is YES**
- the answer to point B is LOW.**

A. Relevance of the paper.

1. Is the subject of the manuscript within scope of the journal?

☒ Yes

☐ No

2. Previous publication of the material

☒ No

☒ Yes. Of course, there are many papers in literature dealing with cutting propagation of rose, as well as with the application of polyamines as rooting co-factors. However, this paper is based on the use of spermine for improving cutting propagation of two specific (and commercially important) rose species, with some results of practical importance. Hence, we can consider the manuscript sufficiently innovative for publication in POP as "**Research note**" (see below).

B. Scientific and practical importance of the data

- ☐ High
☒ Adequate
☐ Low – See comments

C. Scientific quality

1. *Are the data in this manuscript new?*

☒ Yes

☐ No.

Comments:.....

2. *Is the manuscript clearly written and well-organized?*

☒ Yes

☐ No.

Comments:.....

3. *Are the Abstract and the Key words adequate?*

☒ Yes

☐ No.

Suggestions:.....

4. *Does the Introduction state the aim of the research and present knowledge?*

☒ Yes

☒ No. Comments: As, in my opinion, the manuscript is adequate as a “Research note”, ‘Introduction’ should be reduced of about 1/3, so reducing also the number of citations (see also comment to point 9)

.....

5. *Materials, methods and study design*

☒ Adequate

☐ Improvement needed. Suggestions:.....

☐ Inadequate. Comments:.....

6. *Results and Discussion*

☐ Properly drawn with regard to methods and data

☒ Should be adjusted – Suggestions: As the statistical analysis should be redone by separating the data of the two different species (see comment to point 8), hence also ‘Results’ should be rewritten with sub-headings for the two species. As for a ‘Research note’, ‘Discussion’ should be shortened.

☐ Insufficiently supported – Comments:

.....

7. *Are the tables and figures titles and legends presented well and necessary?*

☐ Yes

X Improvement needed. Suggestions: Two separate tables (one per species) should be presented (see also comments to points 6 and 8). Moreover, 12 pictures are too much, as many of them are very repetitive. Authors should present just one picture plate, selecting 4 pictures (two per species, one from semi-hardwood and one from hardwood cuttings) and describe them more exhaustively in the caption.

.....

☐ No.

Comments:.....

8. Data and statistical treatment

☐ Adequate

X Improvement needed. Comments: In my opinion, a 3-factor ANOVA is not correct in this case, as one of the factor refers to two different species. This produces, of course, a large additional variability that interferes with the evaluation of treatment effects. In addition, the application of the mean separation test produces a table where too many means must be compared (see, e.g., how many letters have to be reported after each mean value), with the consequence that the interpretation of table data are very tiring and difficult. Two separate 2-factor ANOVAs will produce for sure a more appropriate evaluation of the treatment effect, and tables easier to read and to interpret.

☐ Inadequate. Comments:.....

9. Have all relevant literature been cited

X Yes. On the opposite, too many citations are reported (51!). Several of them are repetitive, some too old, some useless. This is not a review paper, so Authors must be an effort to select a maximum of 20-25 citations, especially if the manuscript will be re-submitted as a 'Research note'

X No. Suggestions:.....

E. Recommendations (after corrections)

☐ The paper should be published as it is now, or with minor editorial changes

☐ The paper could be published after minor revision, and need not be re-reviewed

X The paper could be accepted after major revision according to the comments as a 'Research note' (see comments below)

☐ Rejected

If adjustments or revision is recommended

X The writer is allowed to contact me (sign both copies of this checklist)

☐ I want to be anonymous (sign only one copy of this checklist)

☐ I am not willing to review this paper again (revision)

Please add further comments.

To the Editor: the manuscript contains some information that are of practical interest for rose nurseries. In addition, it is well-written and evidences a quite large work behind. The main correction I suggest to the Authors concerns a different statistical elaboration of data (see point 8).

Now the point is: the quantity of information produced are “at the border line” for producing a “full-length paper”. In my opinion, the manuscript, after revision, is more appropriate for a “Research note”. However, I leave to the experience of the main Editor the final decision if to accept this report as a full-length paper, or as a ‘Research note’.


