

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126558
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro androgenic responses in tropical genotypes of maize (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Research article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Topic of research is very impressive and relevant one. Title and abstract clearly matches the story of the investigation. Currently, this androgenesis method is relevant in tissue engineering sector to rescue important crop varieties from the ill-effects of climate change. Maize is one of the important cereal crops in India and its <i>in vitro</i> androgenesis carries special interest when PGR research is also involved to it. I would like to thanks authors for choosing this type of amazing problem to work on. All the sub-sections are well-written with appropriate supporting justifications. Pictorial representation could be better and the conclusion portion needs to be modified with some future directions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	OK	
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.	OK. But could be better.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Overall good but I couldn't get why the author has chosen different kinds of PGRs at different concentrations for bio-efficacy evaluation. Better to choose 1 or 2 PGRs with same concentration or play with concentrations to optimize the best one. Statistical interference is not so impressive. Need more cited literatures as supporting documents. Most of the literature used in the study is of very old. Author is requested to add some current works relevant to the concerned problem.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Very old. Need of updatation.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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:	Kinjal Mondal
Department, University & Country	Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture And Technology, India