



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 56341

Title: EFFECT OF PROPAGULR AND PLANTING PATTERN ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF PINEAPPLE.

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision**.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript investigates the effects of propagule type (crown, slip, sucker) and planting pattern (single-row and double-row) on growth and yield of pineapple under tropical conditions in Ogbomoso, Nigeria. The topic is agronomically relevant and practically important for improving pineapple productivity in tropical agro-ecologies. The study addresses a clear research gap by evaluating the interaction between planting material and spatial arrangement. The factorial RCBD design is appropriate, and the dataset appears comprehensive (growth, reproductive, and yield parameters across multiple sampling stages).

However, the manuscript requires minor to moderate revision due to:

- Inconsistencies in experimental description (replication number conflict)
- Several statistical and data presentation issues
- Language and formatting errors
- Some contradictions between results and recommendations
- Weak integration of tables with narrative discussion

The study has merit but requires careful technical and editorial refinement before publication.

Content and Originality

Strengths:

- Clear objective and logical hypothesis.
- Factorial combination allows evaluation of interaction effects.
- Location-specific recommendation adds practical value.
- Yield range (22.36–84.71 t ha⁻¹) demonstrates strong treatment differentiation.
- Strong evidence supporting superiority of sucker propagules.

Weaknesses:

- The recommendation section states:

“The establishment of pineapple using suckers in a double row planting system is recommended”

REVIEWER'S REPORT

However, throughout the results and discussion, single-row planting improved mean fruit weight, and sucker × single-row often performed best for fruit mass. This creates inconsistency between results and final recommendation.

- No economic analysis (cost-benefit of propagule types or planting density).
- No soil analysis data presented.
- No clear explanation of plant population per hectare under each planting pattern.
- No cultivar name specified.

Recommendation:

Clarify which treatment combination truly produced the highest yield and align conclusions accordingly. Consider including plant density figures and economic implications.

Technical Quality

1. Experimental Design Issue

There is a minor inconsistency:

- Line 97–99 states:

“replicated 4 times”

- But earlier it says:

“three replications”

This must be clarified immediately.

2. Statistical Issues

- DMRT is acceptable but considered outdated in some journals; consider Tukey HSD.
- In Table 7, fruit yield for:
 - Single row = 22.36 t/ha
 - Double row = 35.63 t/ha

Yet earlier discussion suggests single-row improved yield. This contradicts data.

- Superscripts (e.g., 22.36^f) imply comparison across combined treatments, but table formatting is confusing.
- Some probability labels inconsistent:
 - “Prob F (0.05) **”
 - Should report exact P-values or consistent notation.

3. Data Presentation Problems

- Decimal formatting inconsistent (e.g., 34,73 instead of 34.73).
- Typographical errors in tables:
 - “Propagation propagules”
 - “Doublerow”
 - “Singlerow”
 - “Total Fruit weight (kg)” appears inconsistent with earlier “Mean fruit weight”.
- Some values unrealistic formatting:
 - “1.211.a”
 - “34.711a”

Tables require professional reformatting.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Language and Presentation

Language is generally understandable but contains frequent minor grammatical and typographical errors.

Examples:

- "Planting pattern are also critical determinants" → *Planting patterns are...*
- "This study determine the effects" → *determined*
- "Fruit characteristics were recommended" → grammatically incorrect.
- "as the need arises" → *as needed*
- "REFERENCES" → spelling error.
- Inconsistent capitalization (RESULT vs Discussion vs Experimental site).

Overall language quality: Moderate but needs editing.

Recommend professional proofreading.

Structure and Organization

Strengths:

- Standard scientific structure followed.
- Logical progression from vegetative to reproductive parameters.
- Clear subheadings for each parameter.

Weaknesses:

- Excessive repetition in Results section ("as shown in table..." repeated frequently).
- Discussion section could better integrate literature comparison.
- Conclusion repeats many results instead of synthesizing insights.
- Recommendation contradicts some findings.

Improvement Suggestions:

- Merge repetitive results sentences.
- Improve flow between tables and interpretation.
- Shorten conclusion and focus on minor takeaway.
- Ensure recommendation aligns with statistically highest yield.

References and Citations

Strengths:

- Recent references (2020–2024).
- Good mix of agronomy and horticulture journals.

Weaknesses:

- Inconsistent formatting:
 - "andGarcía" (missing space)
 - "RevistaBrasileira"
 - Journal names inconsistently italicized
- FAO citation not properly formatted (no URL or access date).
- Some references appear generic (Crop Science Journal 64(1), 78–87) — verify authenticity.

Ensure journal style formatting (APA or target journal style).

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Overall Recommendation

The study is scientifically relevant and provides useful agronomic insights, particularly confirming:

- Suckers are superior propagules.
- Planting pattern significantly modifies vegetative and yield parameters.
- Strong propagule × planting pattern interaction exists.

However, due to:

- Statistical inconsistencies
- Replication confusion
- Data formatting issues
- Contradictory recommendation
- Language and table errors

The manuscript requires substantial revision before acceptance.

Final Decision:

Minor Revision Required