

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_78373
Title of the Manuscript:	Influences of 6-Benzylaminopurine, activated charcoal and polyvinylpyrrolidone on the production of embryogenic calli in cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L.) through cotyledon, nucellus and testa
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalbj.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The study has no originality and innovation in terms of neither the method used nor the material used. There are already many and sufficient studies on Cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L.).</p> <p>The writing language used in the article is quite fluent and interestingly, transitions are made between sentences. When this situation was investigated in more detail, it was understood that the article was written by quoting quite a lot and even strikingly from some previously published scientific articles. This is a situation that is not accepted at all in scientific writing rules. A number of editorial citations have been made from the articles listed below. If the publication of the article is to be accepted by the editor, they must be corrected and rewritten by the author/authors.</p> <p>The figures given in the study are difficult to understand. Giving the introduction, material methods and conclusion stages of the study is also important for the reader to understand.</p> <p>The discussion part is very short and poorly written.</p> <p>1. Moyo, M., Van Staden, J. Micropropagation of Anacardiaceae species of economic importance: advances and future prospects. In Vitro Cell.Dev.Biol.-Plant 49, 85–96 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11627-012-9483-7</p> <p>2. METHODS IN MOLECULAR BIOLOGY™ 318 Plant Cell Culture Protocols SECOND EDITION Edited by Victor M. Loyola-Vargas Feli...Author: Víctor M. Loyola-Vargas Felipe Vázquez-Flota</p> <p>3.K.P. Martin, Plant regeneration through direct somatic embryogenesis on seed coat explants of cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L.), Scientia Horticulturae, Volume 98, Issue 3, 2003, Pages 299-304,ISSN 0304-4238, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4238(03)00005-0.</p> <p>4. https://www.phytojournal.com/archives/2019/vol8issue5S/PartF/SP-8-5-29-951.pdf</p> <p>5. file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/15136-Article%20Text-271340-1-10-20140311.pdf</p> <p>It contains similarities with many articles such as these articles.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Mehmet Sezgin
Department, University & Country	Çankiri Karatekin University, Turkey