

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128409
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of Sucrose Concentration in Micropropagation of valuable aquascape plant Echinodorus greisebachii
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>I received a very interesting scientific paper for editing. The topic on which it was worked is significant and relevant. But a lot of work needs to be done on the scientific paper to highlight the significance of the research. These are my main observations:</p> <p>Introduction - well presented, but there are few cited sources that have worked on the issue. It is interesting that these missing literature sources are cited in the results and discussion. This is not where they should be.</p> <p>Material and methods - very well described. Only a visual description of the experiment is missing (which is found in the second column of the results obtained).</p> <p>Results and discussion - In this part of the work, it is good for the author to give a personal opinion about the results obtained and to make a scientific justification of the data obtained. If possible, it would be good to provide photos of the experiment (if any were taken). Please, if possible, describe in detail why it is necessary to use such a high concentration of BAP, which in principle has an inhibitory effect on plants. The cited authors Baby, G. et al. should be distinguished in the text from <i>a</i> and <i>b</i> in the cited literature. In general, with corrections, I agree with the publication of this scientific work.</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:	Stanislava Stateva
Department, University & Country	Bulgaria