| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JABB_48434** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **MICRO PROPAGATION OF *Pterocarpussantalinoides* USING THREE DIFFERENT GROWTH MEDIA** |
| 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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 | **TITLE:**<br>Micropropagation (together)<br>Pterocarpus santalinoides (separate)<br><br>**ABSTRACT:**<br>Study Design:<br>I believe it refers to the experimental design of the study. This was also not described in the work methodology.<br>Place and Duration of Study:<br>"Pterocarpussantalinoides was carried" is gray.<br>Keywords:<br>I suggest replacing the keywords "Micropropagation, growth medium, Pterocarpussantalinoides" with others that contextualize the article, since these are already included in the title.<br><br>**INTRODUCTION:**<br>Paragraph 4: It is too long. I suggest breaking it down into at least two paragraphs.<br>It remains to describe the purpose of the study. It should come at the end of the introduction to justify the completion of the work.<br><br>**MATERIALS AND METHODS:**<br>2.5 Culture Media and Condition:<br>"The pH was adjusted." For how much?<br>2.6.2 Inoculation Procedure:<br>Any bibliographic reference for this procedure?<br>2.7 Germination Studies:<br>Any bibliographical references for these analyzes?<br>The representation of the equation was not used properly. I suggest using the tool: "Insert Equation" of the word or incorporate the equation into the text ex: Percentage germination = [(Number of germinated seeds X 100) / Total number of seeds planted].<br>2.8.2 Leaf Area:<br>Any bibliographic reference for this procedure?<br><br>There is no description of the statistical design of the experiment.<br>In the manuscript, I did not identify the use of statistical tests to validate the data got with the study. Not even there are error bars to identify or not the differences between the media.<br>For the treatments adopted, I suggest the application of the analysis of variance test (F test) and later the Tukey averages test to identify differences between the culture media on each analyzed variable.<br><br>**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:**<br>Figure 1 is unnecessary. I suggest replacing Table 1 and Figure 1 with a column chart, where: on the "X" axis are the treatments and on the "Y" axis are the percentages of germination.<br>The informational keys of the acronyms should be incorporated into the legends of the figures.<br>There is no need to express the same data in two different ways. I suggest following the modifications in Figure 1 and Table 1 for all the data presented.<br>Todas as novas figuras devem ter algum teste estatístico para validar os dados e esclarecer que houve diferença entre os meios de cultura utilizados nesta variável. Além | All the modifications / corrections suggested by the reviewers have been done accordingly. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | de apresentar os títulos dos eixos “X” e “Y”.<br>The discussion of the results is limited to comparison with other studies, without explaining the effects of the media used in the species' physiology studied. Why was the MS medium better? Why the other media did not have the expected effects?<br><br>**REFERENCES:**<br><br>Total citations: 15<br>citations before the year 2000: 2 (13%)<br>citations between 2001 and 2010: 8 (53%)<br>citations between 2011 and 2019: 5 (34%)<br><br>Type of citation:<br>Scientific articles: 13<br>Web sites: 2<br><br>I suggest a review of references to meet the journal’s standards. Writing the full name of the journals in the references, not abbreviations.<br>The manuscript presents 53% of the citations between the years 2001 and 2010. I suggest an update of the references, especially in the introduction. The introduction should present more recent information on the topic that will be covered in the article. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | If there are photos of the experiment, please add them to the manuscript. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The study is interesting. Present important results for the local farming community and researchers.<br>The practicality of the study is very relevant.<br>The method used is satisfactory to achieve the main aim of the work.<br>However, some corrections and suggestions should be made to make the article publishable.<br>The work needs a grammatical revision of English and a revision of the document formatting.<br>Excess of double spaces between words, united words, punctuation errors, among others were perceived in the text.<br>Perhaps the incompatibility between software, from the file I received, caused changes in the text's structure. However, they deserve to be reviewed throughout the article.<br>For the validation of the results a statistical test should be applied. The same must be represented in the figures.<br>A single figure, preferably in the style of columns should replace the tables, as well as the figures that present the same data.<br>The discussion should also be based on theoretical and practical knowledge on the subject. Besides the comparison with other works, as already described in the manuscript. | |

**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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |