



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Biotechnology Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BBJ_21529
Title of the Manuscript:	An efficient plant regeneration of field mustard (<i>Brassica campestris</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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Improve title: Development of an efficient plant regeneration system of field mustard (<i>Brassica campestris</i>) CV....? add the cultivar name since many papers have been published on regeneration of mustard.</p> <p>Regeneration of (<i>Brassica campestris</i>) had earlier been reported by many authors. It would be interesting to include and compare your results with them.</p> <p>Why the authors did not use the other types of auxins and cytokinins for shoot regeneration of hypocotyl and cotyledon explants?? such as TDZ and zeatin, IAA and...? Since those hormones are more potential for <i>in vitro</i> shoot multiplication.</p> <p>Add bar for figure 1 to show real scale of plants.</p>	<p>The title is being modified accordingly. Although <i>Brassica campestris</i> cv. BARI sarisha-12 has been used for optimization of regeneration protocol of <i>B. Campestris</i>, we developed improved regeneration protocol for five cultivars of <i>B. campestris</i> grown in Bangladesh. Therefore, we believe the modified title "Development of an efficient plant regeneration system of field mustard (<i>Brassica campestris</i>)" is appropriate for the manuscript.</p> <p>Reviewer comment has been incorporated accordingly in section 3.2 and 3.4 of manuscript.</p> <p>We did not use other types of auxins and cytokinins like IAA and TDZ or Zeatin because the combinations of BAA and NAA with AgNO₃ provide good response in shoot regeneration.</p> <p>Reviewer comment has been incorporated accordingly in figure 1.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>First paragraph in result and discussion should be transferred to materials and Method.</p> <p>Figure 2, 3 and 7 the authors did not state standard error???? When SE bars did not use, you cannot be sure that the difference between two means is statistically significant?????!!!!</p>	<p>Result and discussion has modified accordingly.</p> <p>Figures 2, 3 and 7 have been converted into Table 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Standard deviations used for each mean and DMRT is done to evaluate whether the values are statistically significant or not.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Material and methods Write the scientific name of alcohol and Clorox.</p> <p>Improve the conclusion (it is too short). Include a brief summary of the paper's main points.</p>	<p>Scientific name of Alcohol and Clorox has been incorporated in the manuscript.</p> <p>Conclusion has been modified accordingly.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		