

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_123605
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Propagation of Two Prunus Rootstocks
Type of the Article	Original 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>

#### 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.	Stone fruits are an important component of fruit production. <i>Prunus</i> rootstocks have been widely propagated by seeds. This usually results in low yields and low quality of the product. The high variability of these materials also reduces their quality. Micropropagation is a suitable propagation method that offers several advantages over conventional propagation. Therefore, this research aims to develop an efficient protocol for in vitro propagation of two <i>Prunus</i> rootstocks that will allow year-round availability of seedlings from a reliable source and with high quality.	
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.	<p>The Abstract is not comprehensive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Citations must be removed from the Abstract.</li> <li>Some details should not be mentioned in the Abstract and can be mentioned in the Introduction section. Please see the attached file.</li> <li>The authors mentioned in the Material section that SH and MS media contained microelements of MS media, please revise and correct in the Abstract.</li> <li>The growth regulators are mentioned in the Abstract for the first time, so the full name must be written before the abbreviation.</li> <li>According to Table 1, QL media in this stage contained MS microelements, please revise and correct.</li> <li>Only one format must be used to express values, mg/l or mg.l-1 throughout the manuscript</li> <li>What is the number of days/weeks between subcultures?</li> <li>According to Table 1, this media in this stage contained DKW microelements, please revise and correct. I suggest delete the word 'macroelements' here</li> <li>According to Table 1, DKW media in this stage contained DKW microelements, please revise and correct. I suggest delete the word 'macroelements' here</li> <li>The Abstract should not end like this. These results should be briefly used to formulate a concluding sentence that explains the importance of these results in propagate these rootstocks.</li> </ul>	
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.	<p>In the Introduction section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please update this reference, it is very old (Fao 2010)</li> <li>A reference must be added to some sentences. Please see the attached file</li> <li>Micropropagation technique and its types should be defined. Moreover, previous recent studies that were interested in the micropropagation of stone fruits should be reviewed.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent studies on the use of growth regulators and culture media in micropropagation (for shoot formation and rooting) should be reviewed.</li> </ul> <p>In the Materials and methods section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This percentage is incorrect (20% NaOCl). Sodium hypochlorite is used at a concentration of 1 to 3%. The authors probably mean that they used a 20% solution of a commercial disinfectant with a concentration of 5% sodium hypochlorite, so the final concentration would be 1%.</li> <li>Here also write the full words of the PGRs used.</li> <li>Why did the authors choose this combination with these concentrations of PGRs “0.5 mg/l-1 BAP, 0.5 mg/l-1 GA3 and 0.01 mg/l-1 NAA.”? The reason must be written in the Materials and methods section.</li> <li>Please specify the type of the soil used in acclimatization.</li> </ul> <p>In the Results and Discussion section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What do the authors mean by "growth factors" here? The same growth regulators have been used for all media !!!</li> <li>Also add discussion with previous reports about the mechanism of action of GA3 and NAA on meristem culture</li> <li>According to the data in Table 3, the values of the Number of reactive meristems was the same as the Number of regenerated shootlets. Please provide an explanation for this in the discussion.</li> <li>The values (<math>\pm</math>SE) should also be added to the data of Table 3</li> <li>In the title of Fig. 2, please specify the subculture number</li> <li>In the title of Fig. 4, place the Figure title at the bottom, and add the following sentence “<i>Bars followed by different letters are significantly different, * P &lt; 0.05 (Duncan test)</i>”</li> <li>‘Duncan test’ should also be added to Table 3 and 4</li> </ul> <p>In the Conclusion section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is preferable that the Conclusions section be one paragraph.</li> <li>The results should not be repeated here, but rather the results should be extrapolated in the form of conclusions.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some references need updating. Please see the attached file</li> <li>Some sentences need related references. Please see the attached file</li> <li>Please follow the format of References as per the journal requirements.</li> </ul>	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ahmed Abdelfattah Elateeq
Department, University & Country	Al-Azhar University, Egypt