

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_114437
Title of the Manuscript:	Rice Mature Seed Derived Embryogenic and Organogenic Calli
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, manuscript is important for the scientific community. Any methods of bringing about improvement in food crops should always be shared within the scientific community. No (Effect of media and photoperiod on organogenic and embryogenic callus induction from mature seed in <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) Yes, abstract is comprehensive. However, it consists of many language errors which need to be addressed. Yes, it is structurally correct. Though titles of some sub-sections need grammar corrections. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. Few more references could be given in the Discussion section to elaborate the effect of media and photoperiod on callogenesis and on plants, in general. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, language in this article has multiple errors, grammatical as well as scientific. There are multiple grammatical errors in the article. I strongly suggest the writer to use a grammar tool and make corrections in all sections of the article, wherever necessary, before resubmitting.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is full of language errors (grammar, spellings and punctuation) which makes it difficult to comprehend it. Suggest the author to resubmit after making these corrections so that scientific accuracy can be judged better in next round of review.</p> <p>Few corrections from the abstract alone are cited below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract, line 3 – “exponentially augmenting of the world population” - The correct phrase should be “exponentially augmenting world population.” Abstract, line 5 - The phrase “which appears to be the potential best way” should be revised to “which appears to be the best potential way.” Abstract, line 7 – “Callus weight was recorded, and the percentage of callus induction was calculated.” – Suggest to rewrite the steps in the order in which they were recorded. In my opinion, percentage of callus induction would be observed before weighing the callus, hence suggest to reorder the text. Abstract, line 11 – “m2 and m1 media showed greater mean callus...” – Please follow proper progression in the text. “Reorder as m1 and m2 media....” Abstract, line 13 (Suggestion) - The phrase “and lower rates came from m3 (73%) and m4 (69%) media” could be revised to “while lower rates came from m3 (73%) and m4 (69%) media.” Abstract, line 15 - The phrase “Culturing the explant on dark environment” should be revised to “Culturing the explant in a dark environment.” <p>Few other corrections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction, line 1 – “Rice (<i>Oryza Sativa</i> L.) is one of the most....” – Scientific name is not written as per rules of botanical nomenclature. Please correct “<i>Oryza Sativa</i> L.” to “<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.” Figures – In photo plate b, embryogenic callus is not visible. Replace it. In photo plate d, 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>embryogenic callus is not very clear, suggest to replace with a high-resolution photo plate with better visibility of embryos.</p> <p>9. Figures – The titles of photo plates need correction. There are spacing errors in titles of figures e and g – There should be space before “obtained” in both cases.</p> <p>10. Figures – Please mention all the observations in either days or weeks. Here observations are mentioned as: 4 days, 21 days, 6 weeks. Please correct them to “1 week, 3 weeks, 6 weeks” or change all to “days”.</p> <p>11. References – In references 3, 4 and 9, Accessed and Available information are also mentioned. Please check the publication rules to confirm the format.</p> <p>12. References – In Reference 9, title is written in uppercase. Please check and correct.</p> <p>13. References – In Reference 7, “Ghobeishavi, H., Ebrahim D, Alavikia SS, et al.”, Dot after “H.” should be removed.</p> <p>14. Results – In section 3.2, line 5 – “m2 and m1 media showed greater mean callus induction...”, change the order to “m1 and m2...”</p> <p>15. Results – In section 3.2, line 7 – “environment (85,5%)...” should be corrected to “environment (85.5%)...”</p> <p>16. Results – Section 3.3 – The text says, callus weight was recorded after 6 weeks of culture, however, title of table 3 shows “observations after 5 weeks of culture”. There is discrepancy in the period at which observations were recorded and reported.</p> <p>17. Results – Suggest to show observations for “percentage of callus induction” and “callus weight” at 3 weeks of culture too, since as per Material and Methods, section 3.2 – Subculture was performed after 3 weeks of culture. This gives observation in a proper progression during callogenesis.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Rashmi Kapoor Mehrotra
Department, University & Country	India