



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_48198
Title of the Manuscript:	Plant Regeneration via Somatic Embryogenesis in Solanum nigrum (black nightshade)
Type of the 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>)

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>Authors refer to direct embryogenesis from cotyledonary sections (L. 23 and the Titles of the Tables and once in the Discussion). Despite direct embryogenesis from cotyledons is possible, the Figures used to illustrate the evolution of the explants in the lab, e.g., Figs. 1a, 1b and 1e apparently depicted some sort of callusing. In addition, authors do not refer to direct embryogenesis in most of the Discussion or the main Conclusion section at the end of the manuscript. In my opinion, the citations of direct somatic embryogenesis should be eliminated</p> <p>Authors indicated that the transit of globular embryos in torpedo embryos (conversion?) "was found to be dependent on the level of NAA" (L. 100 - 101). Embryos on the explants were observed one by one in order to evaluate the "conversion into bipolar embryos" as noted in Tables 1 and 2? How was it possible to identify different globular embryos in the neighborhood of each other? If it has not been done, the title for the columns in Tables 1 and 2 shall be substituted and the statement mentioned above shall be revised.</p> <p>Authors cited in the Introduction that "The plants regenerated via somatic embryogenesis are of single cell origin with true-to-type and are produced in large numbers within a short period [3,4]". However, figures G-L (Figure 2? I did not find the caption/legend) depicts structures that are apparently joined or growing from a common basal tissue. It is possible, as well. Authors should read papers on Bromeliaceae and palm trees.</p> <p>Authors stated in the Discussion that "This is probably because of conversion of some of the heartshaped embryos to torpedo or cotyledonary stage embryos and their subsequent germination in the</p>	<p>Direct somatic embryogenesis is eliminated from the text and tables</p> <p>Yes we have observed periodically the developmental stages of somatic embryogenesis</p> <p>Germination or plant formation means the development of roots also.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>presence of IAA+BAP" (L. 215-6). Are the authors sure to have observed what is described?</p> <p>Conversion of heart-shaped to torpedo embryos????? Have the authors ever read about the occurrence of fused cotyledons in tissue culture?</p> <p>Authors use many different terms to indicate that heart shaped embryos are developing. At the end it is not possible to understand what is the meaning given to conversion, germination, or plant formation. In addition, germination is generally used to indicate the production of seedlings by the seeds. This issue should be addressed to improve the clarity of the manuscript. The use of a single term for each process and the inclusion of a short explanation about its meaning would help.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	