

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127509
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing the protocol for in vitro regeneration through callus in rice varieties, viz , Ratnagiri-8, Karjat Shatabdi and Karjat-3
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	Substitution is the most priority of environment to sustain,as limited resources are available. Thus, article provides a hope for a research area, further nutrition and experimental study required to establish important of specimen	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Short abstract in providing introduction, only main result should be incorporated	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not	
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.	Avoid unnecessary lengthening of article, discussion should be in the form to justify aims and objectives of the study. More research work published on this specimen should have been discussed in detail	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Regeference are not as per guidelines	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Abstract, avoid unwanted lengthening of abstract. 2. Avoid unnecessary lengthening of introduction and plagiarism in introduction 3. Authentication of specimen required 4. Discussion not scientific 5. Conclusion, rewrite 6. Reference not as per guidelines	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shashi Gupta
Department, University & Country	India