

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126784
Title of the Manuscript:	Establishment of In-vitro Regeneration Protocol of Aegle Marmelos (L.): A Sacred Medicinal Tree.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a reliable regeneration protocol for <i>Aegle marmelos</i> , a medicinally valuable and culturally significant species. Given the limited success of traditional propagation due to low seed viability, this research provides a vital micropropagation alternative, potentially aiding conservation and large-scale planting efforts. The systematic approach to optimizing the in-vitro regeneration process is impressive, highlighting key factors for successful plantlet development and survival.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is mostly suitable but could be refined for clarity. Suggested title: "In-vitro Regeneration Protocol Optimization for <i>Aegle marmelos</i> (L.): A Sacred Medicinal Tree."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, covering the objectives, methods, and results effectively. It might benefit from mentioning specific hormonal treatments that yielded the best results for shoot and root formation.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsection arrangement are appropriate and well-organized, supporting a clear flow from background to methodology and results.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, employing validated micropropagation techniques that align with previous research while also testing unique treatment combinations. The inclusion of statistical analysis for treatment efficacy further reinforces its scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are adequate but could be enhanced with more recent studies on micropropagation techniques for medicinal plants if available.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally acceptable for scholarly communication, though a few grammatical adjustments may improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	The study might further discuss the environmental conditions post-transplant to natural soil, as this could impact survival rates and inform practical applications.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Sankareswaran
Department, University & Country	Muthayammal College of Arts and Science, India