



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_45795
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on anther culturing an effective tool in double haploid production
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	There are a lot of grammatical mistakes. English proofreading and editing need to be concerned. I strongly advise that the author revises the manuscript and resubmits after finishing the complete version. Using all abbreviations should indicate the full name in the first time and not necessary to use the full name in another time. - Double haploids (DHs) which present in line7, it is not necessary to use full name again in line 22 and 23. - 2,4-D should be 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) in line 108, but in line 109 should be only 2,4-D. Avoiding starts sentences with number of reference. For example, line 62, 73, 80...etc. Table number should be Table 1 and Table 2 instead of Table 1.1 and 1.2. Each tables need footnote to explain the full name of the media. In line 97, NH₄⁺ should be NH₄⁺. Figure 1 is not necessary to show. The headline in the second box and the third box are not clear.	
Minor REVISION comments	The author should consider the author guideline which advises that a review paper should contain 5,000-9,000 words with 3-5 figures and/or tables.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Varaporn Veraplakorn
Department, University & Country	Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand