

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120319
Title of the Manuscript:	A novel method of in planta transformation in Lilium
Type of the Article	Short communication

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript lacks substantial data and evidence to support the claims made. The absence of experimental results, figures, tables, and illustrations undermines its scientific validity. Without concrete data, the manuscript fails to make a meaningful contribution to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "A novel method of in planta transformation in Lilium," is misleading as the manuscript does not provide sufficient evidence or novelty to justify the claim of introducing a new method.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive and does not provide specific findings or significant results. It merely summarizes the methodology without presenting any concrete outcomes or implications. The abstract should include quantitative data and key results to give readers a clear understanding of the study's contributions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is inadequate. It lacks clear and distinct subsections, which makes it difficult to follow the flow of information. Each section should be clearly defined with appropriate headings and subheadings to enhance readability and organization.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It does not present any experimental data, figures, or tables to support the claims made. The methodology and results sections are particularly weak and lack the necessary detail and rigor expected in scientific research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Additional references from the past five years should be included to enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A thorough proofreading and editing process is necessary to improve readability and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Senthil
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India