



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_42331
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative studies on vegetative and in vitro propagation of elite selected jojoba strains
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>)

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	1- Large number of typographical and grammatical error are there throughout the manuscript. 2- Abstract: does not report the results obtained. 3- Introduction: Large number of micropropagation studies have been conducted on Jojoba but none of them is mentioned by the author/s 4- Material and methods: authors have mentioned that two types of explants were tested, but there is no any table to show the comparative results obtained. Explants were collected in fortnightly from Feb to May, but no data shown and comparison was made. 5- During sterilization an exposure of mercuric chloride 0.1% for 15 min., it is very very high, I doubt the explants could have been survived that too the juvenile explants. 6- In the section 'culture medium and plant growth regulators' what ever treatments were mentioned could not been represented in tabular form and what was the criteria to select the concentration and combination of plant growth regulators? 7- Regarding statistical analysis, after how many weeks the data was analysed and also how many explants were planted in each vial. In fig 1 variable number of explants are seen in different treatments.????? 8- Result and discussion: Comparative analysis has not been made as it was summed by the objective. The combination treatments mentioned as BA + NAA, BA + TDZ etc. have not been mentioned in the material and methods????? 9- Discussion is insufficient and the conclusion is not made as per the results obtained.	1- Typographical and grammatical error was reviewed 2- The abstract is completely considered with results 3- I agree with this comment and it was taken into consideration 4- Regarding two types used as explant (shoot tip and nodal segments), shoot tips could not survival that is why I do not make a comparative table (data is zero for shoot tips). For comparison among time. Regarding explants collected in fortnightly, we did not recorded data about the effect of the date, and we just want to determine the best date through our observation of explant potential to proliferate. 5- I agree with this comment and it was typing mistake. 6- I apologize for this disturbance between what mentioned in this section and what are tabulated, it was also typing mistake and corrected. 7- Statistical analysis (the number of weeks mentioned in this part) number of plants were fixed as five plants per jar in the last subculture. 8- Combination treatments corrected as recommended by the reviewer 9- More discussion added to the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		