



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_44027
Title of the Manuscript:	Whole Plants Regeneration of Cassava Cultivars (<i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz) Originated From Côte d'Ivoire Via Somatic Embryogenesis
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>)



[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	<p>Using all abbreviations should indicate the full name in the first time and not necessary to use the full name in another time. In addition, the abbreviation of media should be described the formulae in the first time. The good example of using abbreviation is COM in page 4 line 119-121.</p> <p>- Pic is short for picloram but it is Picl in Table 1 and 2.</p> <p>The result in experiment 3.1 must be improved. It would be easy to understand if the results are separated into two tables for FSE and NSE. Each parameter can be separated to describe. Consequently, data in table 2 will be easy to consider in every column.</p> <p>Table 1 is no need to separate into two sets if it is parallel with table 2 by giving the first column as plant growth regulators.</p> <p>Foot note of each column must be "Within the same column,.....instead of the same line.</p> <p>- Page 3 line 88-89 "The same set of.....with Picloram." This sentence is ambiguous. Is it means the sets of immature leaf lobes were cultured on MS.....supplemented with five concentrations of 2,4-D or Picloram?</p> <p>- Page 4 line 99-100 "Green cotyledon pieces.....with 50 µM NAA. This sentence needs to complete this step by adding the objective and duration time. For example, with 50 µM NAA for 2 weeks to induce secondary cotyledon.</p> <p>- Page 4 line 103 Need to indicate what the treatments.</p> <p>- Page 4 line 114 Need to improve the topic of the experiment. This experiment was determined the effects of auxins under light and dark condition.</p> <p>- Page 4 line 116 NAA or AIB must be NAA or IBA.</p> <p>- Page 5 line 151were observed in all cultivars on which media?</p> <p>- Page 5 line 156with all concentrations of which media?</p> <p>- Page 6 figure 1H is not presented in text.</p> <p>- Page 7 Where does figure A come from?</p> <p>- Page 11 In table 3, there are some mistakes in the column "number of some embryos". - It is impossible that 168 is followed by letter b and 185.5 is followed by letter c. - What is the letter following 178.4?</p> <p>- Page 12 line 214-215 How does the data represent the result? - line 214 Where did 70 of 70-83% come from? - line 214 Where did 75 of 75-81% and 53 of 53-81 come from?</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>- Page 13 Experiment 3.4 and 3.5 need to add table to present the results</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>- For the first experiment, it should be suggested that 2,4-D gave the better result for M, I and Dr while Picloram was suitable for the other cultivars. (this issue should be included in the result section.) Which research agreed with this result?</p> <p>- Page 14 line 257,258 ANA must be NAA</p> <p>- Page 14 line 259-260 The present resultwith others [25,15]. This sentence does not make sense since all treatments were added with BA where some treatments were combination with NAA or IBA. This should be discussed in case of better result due to using NAA or IBA instead of the effect of BA.</p> <p>- Page 14 line 264-266 Although the frequency.....under 16h light. This sentence is incorrect. According to table 4, the media added with NAA gave the better result under light condition while the media added with IBA gave the better result under dark condition. (This issue should be included in the result section.) Which research agreed with this result?</p> <p>- Page 14 line 269-271 There was no evidence to indicate that To was efficient in embryogenesis but less proficient in organogenesis. To did not show the best result for embryogenesis and did also not show the lowest result in bud production. Please give the reason that why suggesting this cultivar.</p> <p>- Page 14 line 271-273 This result....inherited traits. This reason need to add reference(s).</p> <p>- Page 15 line 297 P-CIM is not presented in text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Varaporn Veraplakorn
Department, University & Country	Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand