

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_121050
Title of the Manuscript:	Rapid in vitro propagation, ex vitro acclimation and reintroduction of Rhododendron inaequale Hutch - an endemic plant to Northeast India
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>

Review Form 3

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the urgent need for conservation strategies for endangered plant species. I find this manuscript particularly valuable because it combines both laboratory and field-based approaches, showcasing the full spectrum of modern conservation strategies. But there is a Limited Scope of Media and Hormone Concentrations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>NO, Title does not provide the meaning of the work done. If the study focuses on a specific aspect of propagation or reintroduction, consider highlighting that in the title. Consider whether "ex vitro acclimation" and "reintroduction" are clearly understood. If not, you might use more common terms or briefly explain them. Colon Use in place of dash</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The phrase "requires abrupt conservation measures" could be made clearer. Summarize the broader implications of your findings. For instance, how do these results contribute to the conservation of <i>Rhododendron inaequale</i> or similar species?</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction is little long. Alignment in introduction Discussion part can be more strong.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Ensure that all abbreviations and terms are defined the first time they are used. When presenting results, it is helpful to mention the statistical significance of your findings if applicable. Clarify the purpose of distributing the 200 micropropagated plants. Are these intended for further research, conservation, or restoration efforts?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>A Few references can be added more. There is no reference after 2022. Add some recent references 1. Discussion part can be improved by adding new references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Required to improve. Spelling, spacing, punctuation marks and grammatical errors are required to improve. Add more recent references</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Highlighted in manuscript</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Kuldip Chandra Verma
Department, University & Country	Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, India