



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13980
Title of the Manuscript:	Callus Induction and Plant Regeneration from Shoot Tips of Ginger (Zingiber officinale Rosc.)
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	Result and Discussion no tables and Authors not clearly indicate specific concentration individual or combination treatment hormones. Ex. 2.0 mg/l BAP+0.5 mg/l 2,4-D or BAP 2.0ng/l ,0.5 mg/l 2,4-D. Need statistical analysis either SD OR DUNKENS MULTIPLETEST. RESULTS NEED STATISICAL TABLE. NO NEED FIGURE. TABLE CONTAIN mean+ SD. PHOTOPLATE INSTEREDOF PLATE-1.Fig.a. I CLEARLY INDICATE NEED TABLE	We did all the suggestions of the other three reviewers and they accept the figures not tables. So, if we change it to tables that will change all discussion style. Otherwise, we can put all statistical and regular tables as appendix. On this respect, would you please inform us your final decision whether we follow the decision of the first three authors in considering the figures as it is or otherwise.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		