

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_117457
Title of the Manuscript:	"Tissue Culture: A New Era in Vegetable Crop Micro propagation"
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes- It provides the scientific information about the tissue culture in the new era in vegetable crop micro propagation Tissue Culture: A New Era in Vegetable Crop Micro propagation" Yes- but it can also mention as 'Vegetable crop micro propagation by tissue culture in new era'</p> <p>Yes- The abstract is in limited word but not shows the keywords.</p> <p>Yes- It shows subsection and structure of manuscript which is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes- But only adds future suggestion at the end for path to next research.</p> <p>Yes- For the references research paper used sufficient, but references books used very less to related topic. Also add recent research references related to subject.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality of article is suitable, but checks spelling and grammatical issues in some sentences</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After some minor changes the research manuscript is good. The manuscript could be suitable for publication after the author has responded to reviewer comments and made changes should include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add key words in abstract. • Add recent references books in references. • Check grammar and some words spelling 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jige Sandipan Babasaheb
Department, University & Country	Sant Ramdas College, India