



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Biotechnology Journal
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The format of data presentation in Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 7 is difficult to read and compare. And in Fig. 7 the data is not continuous. The data in these figures should be converted into tables. The agar used (10%) is quite unusual as generally 0.8% is found in most reports. 10% means you add 100 g per liter! 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Since some data need to be presented in Table format, data description in section 3.2 "Optimal media for shoot regeneration" do not need to reiterate every treatment. You just need to compare the best or the worst ones, as reader can read all data in your tables.</p> <p>Ethical issue: The data in Fig. 2-5 seem to have a similar pattern of increasing initially to peak then down. I can't tell if these data are from real experiment or makeup, as they look so perfect.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fure-Chyi Chen
Department, University & Country	Department of Plant Industry, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan