

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_103698
Title of the Manuscript:	The Establishment of Two Efficient Transformation Systems in Quinoa ( <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd.)
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. 1. The article is interesting. It challenges the scientific community in general and that of other disciplines in particular (genetics and microbiology). We can say that it provides somewhat original information. There is a certain rigor and consistency in the implementation of the experimentation protocol. It would have been necessary to take other work carried out in other laboratories by other teams and compare them with these, which could have better valued the content of the article. L'intitulé peut être retenu</p> <p>2. 2. It is a bit long but understandable enough.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. 3. It seems to me that the structure and subtitles are relatively consistent and acceptable</p> <p>5.</p> <p>6. 4. The article is written and presented according to the standards (problem, experimentation, comments supported by a good, fairly up-to-date bibliography.</p> <p>7.</p> <p>8. 5. Well-written citations are quite numerous, generally up-to-date and relevant to the topic of the article.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language used is clear, the writing is understandable. Often, in fact, the articles are poorly written or difficult to understand because of the language (essential communication tool). In this article the steps are well developed and fairly clearly reported in the language used.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Notes to consider:</p> <p>1. The scientific names of plant species or microorganisms must be written in italics or underlined, in any case to distinguish them from the text.</p> <p>2. The synthetic culture medium MS is to be presented so that we know the different chemicals (which compose it and which activate it).</p> <p>3. The membership of the species is: Chenopodiaceae or Amaranthaceae according to the new nomenclature</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>M. Benabadi Noury</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université de Tlemcen, Algérie</b>