

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_129068
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Regeneration of Corchorus olitorius var. O-4
Type of the 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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Tossa jute has more economic value than other jute genotypes. However, non-availability of modern varieties with improve plant types including resistance to diseases is the major constrain. This part of work could be a step forward for further genetic improvement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title of the article is suitable.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent, however not followed uniform format.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	overall language/English quality of the article needed improvement.	
Optional/General comments	In result discussion, sub-heading should be added for improvement of manuscript. Suggestion for modification of sentences has given in manuscript in track change mode.	

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:	Arpita Moharana
Department, University & Country	ICAR-National Rice Research Institute, India