

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_129068
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Regeneration of Corchorus olitorius var. O-4
Type of the Article	Plant tissue culture

#### **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>

#### **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>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>It is suitable</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>It is preferable to state the aim of the manuscript at the end of the introduction.</b></li> <li>- <b>The introduction, particularly the first and second paragraphs, requires additional more references to substantiate the information presented.</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The manuscript is scientifically accurate but requires rephrasing for many of its sentences.</li> <li>- The figures in the Materials and Methods section are unnecessary and weaken the research.</li> <li>- It is preferable to move figures b and c to the Results section</li> <li>- The researcher did not mention the room temperature in the Materials and Methods section.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The references in the introduction are very few, and there are no references in the Materials and Methods section.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The language is weak in many sentences, and the manuscript needs to be reviewed by a specialist in English, along with a certificate from them stating that the manuscript has been linguistically reviewed.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>How many replicates were used in the experiments?</b></li> <li>- “Shoots were transferred to half strength of MS medium supplemented with different concentrations of IBA for root induction.”, <b>This sentence should be written in the Results section, not in the Materials and Methods section. It needs to be rephrased.</b></li> <li>- <b>There is no discussion of the results in this manuscript, only a comparison of some results. Therefore, there should be a serious physiological discussion of the effects of the treatments in explaining these results, with no fewer than 5-10 sources.</b></li> <li>- This sentence “In this study, experimental material was seed.” should be deleted, and the text should start from the following sentence.</li> <li>- “running water “ It should be replaced with this “Tap water”</li> <li>- “taken out of that solution after 20 minutes” what is this solution? Explain the component.</li> <li>- “cleaned” It should be replaced with this “rinsed”</li> <li>- “After 7 days seeds were germinated” It should be replaced with this “cotyledon with 7 days old”</li> <li>- “various doses” It should be replaced with this “concentrations”</li> <li>- “and control” It is added with the word “treatment”</li> <li>- “For shoot induction, of BAP” It should be replaced with this “callus transferred to the MS medium supplemented with ....”</li> </ul> <p>The researcher mentioned that roots were obtained, but did not reference this in the figures and tables in the Results section. Either they should be added to the Results or removed from the Materials and Methods section.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer’s comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author’s comment</b> (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>
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ihab N. AlAbasi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Mosul, Iraq</b></p>