



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27020
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro Sterilization of Alstroemeria hybrida cv. Pluto
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	First of all I would like to thank to the scientist/s for this study. IN TOPIC: 1- Not "in-vitro" it can be "in vitro" IN ABSTRACT 1- Line 3: "studies....." not necessary. 2- Sentences in abstract are far away from understanding if reader do not follow the text. All data and treatment in a confusion. Please give us briefly and more understandable data. Arcsin must be used only in statistical calculation. The data can be real %. (In result and conclusion too). IN INTRODUCTION: 1- Line 19: top ten cut flowers... (need a reference) 2- GOI, SKUAST, ICAR (can be written clearly in paranthesis one time) IN MATERIAL-METHOD: 1- Line: 43-49: write the explained treatments in paranthesis (S1, S2... ETC.) 2- Line 43: in which University or Institue? 3- Line 51: Briefly what is the culture media MS,WPM, B5 etc. 4- Line 84-85 Why leaves were cut...? Leaves are not being subjected? 5- Line 98: what was the manageable size? 6- Line 99, 107, 108 write please the fungicide and antibiotic's active substance names.	1. Change done IN ABSTRACT 1- Line 3: done 2- the data in values of abstract are for 2 and 4 weeks in each exxplat. IN INTRODUCTION: 1- Line 19: ITS FROM Apeda 2- not necessary IN MATERIAL-METHOD: 1- Line: 43-49: irreverent 2- Line 43done 3- Line 51: MS. 4- Line 84-85 done 5- Line 98 like centimetres 6- Line 99, 107, 108 ,carbendazim and pencillin



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7- Line 106: what was the manageable size in shoot tips and nodal segment? Like in centimetres 8- When rhizome and shoots taken, how was the main plant behaviour? (In flower, dormancy etc.?) Indicate please. Vegetative phase 9- Table 0, table 0.0. unacceptable numbering. Please correct them as 1 and 2. After this all tables number need corrections. In the table and in the text. done 10- In table 0 give merc. Doses (like x%) done 11- Statistical calculation is necessary. If there are no statistically different data give us standard error. IN RESULT: 1- Is PLATE 1, 2 true? Or figure 1, 2 better. Check please author instruction. done 2- Line 170: mentioned statistically.... but can not see any statistics. As per c.d values IN ALL TEXT: 1- Not "<i>Alstroemeria</i> cv. Pluto" it must "<i>Alstroemeria hybrid</i> cv. Pluto" Done 2- Table 8: merc. Doses (like x%) Done 3- Explain Fig 1, 2 which explants are these? Aseptic and bacterial exudates 4- ADD some photographs initial culture belongs to each starting different type of explant. Added two more photographs of aseptic cultures and Fig 1 in manuscript includes 4 photographs of aseptic cultures IN REFERENCE:	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Hakkart and Versluijs is 1988 in list, 1985 in text. Check please. Its 1988	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		