



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17696
Title of the Manuscript:	Somatic embryo formation from the fused protoplasts of <i>Brassica rapa</i> & <i>B. juncea</i>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	TITLE Since the authors used no means or methods to demonstrate that microcalli was produced only from fused protoplasts I suggest an adjustment for the title from "Somatic embryo formation from the fused protoplasts of <i>Brassica rapa</i> & <i>B. juncea</i>" to, for instance, Somatic embryo formation from co-cultivated protoplasts of <i>Brassica rapa</i> & <i>B. juncea</i> INTRODUCTION "U triangle" must be defined. Meaning is not clear. MATERIAL AND METHODS Authors should include the number of calli analyzed for each repetition and include the information about the number of replicas in this section of Methods in addition to the abstract. Modification for B medium in reference number 5 should better be explained	We fused the protoplast of two species with a fusogen and cultured the fused protoplasts. We did not co-cultivated isolated protoplasts of two species. The suggestion is not appropriate to us. However, we thank you for your thoughts and we agree that we did not study the ploidy level of produced somatic embryos. For the greater clarity of the readers U triangle is now inserted as Fig. 1. Thanks. See line 109-111. Did that accordingly. Thanks For the clarity of readers modified compositions of media is now included in Table 1. Thanks for the suggestion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	MATERIAL AND METHODS, LINE 105 Color is not a quantitative trait unless it is measured using wavelength or absorbance, for instance. Despite they had be given numbers for identification I suggest colors should not be treated as quantitative in reason of the subjectivity expected for primary classification.	We agree with you. Revised accordingly. See line number 124-126. Thanks.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		