



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 <i>(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)</i>
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>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>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Material and methods Write the scientific name of alcohol and Clorox. Improve the conclusion (it is too short). Include a brief summary of the paper's main points.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seyed Ali Ravanfar
Department, University & Country	University of Florida, USA