

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_114097
Title of the Manuscript:	Direct Plant Regeneration From Nodal Explants Of Grapefruit (Citrus paradisi Macfad.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Grapefruit is an important citrus species and its propagation has always interest for the community. Although the research lacks innovation and the experiments have been conducted in the past, the main problem is that the results are not clear, due to the absence of the statistical analysis.</p> <p>2. Yes it is.</p> <p>3. Yes it is.</p> <p>4. The manuscript follows the typical structure of a paper, but vital information should be included in all subsections. There is no reference for plant growth regulators in Introduction, experiment is not clearly described in Material and Methods and results are not demonstrated according to the statistical analysis.</p> <p>5. A lot of issues emerge from the manuscript. The number of the initial plant material used as explants is not defined in the Material and Methods section and there is no information about the replicants within each treatment. In addition, statistical analysis is nowhere presented in the manuscript, so all the results are scientifically incorrect.</p> <p>6. Introduction and Discussion are not strongly supported by references, while a number of studies has been conducted on citrus in the recent years. The majority of the References in the manuscript are old.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The language used in the manuscript is acceptable and satisfied.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tzatzani Thiresia - Teresa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Olive Tree Subtropical Crops and Viticulture, Hellenic Agricultural Organization, Greece</b>