



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_45415
Title of the Manuscript:	Study impact of application of vitamins on growth the wheat plantlets cultured in vitro.
Type of the Article	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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This study is repeating basic information. The literature has not been well evaluated.</li> <li>2. The planning is not correct according to the purpose of the study.</li> <li>3. Abstract is not suitable (Factors of the study were not expressed, the results were not completely explained, .....).</li> <li>4. The experiment was to be established with a certain variety or cultivar. The variety of wheat used in this trial is not clear.</li> <li>5. The method is not correctly expressed (Vitamins were added to the nutrient medium, not treatment to plantlets).</li> <li>6. The vitamins in the composition of MS medium: myo-inositol 100 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, Nicotinic acid 0.5 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, Pyridoxine HCl 0.5 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, Thiamine hydrochloride 0.1 mg L<sup>-1</sup>.</li> <li>7. The English presentation is not enough.</li> </ol> <p>This study can be rewritten according to the method. After evaluating the results obtained, rewritten article may be considered. But the literature on this subject should be well evaluated and discussed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- We only tried to know the physiological changes of the plant when applying an external vitamins.</li> <li>2- Ok</li> <li>3- On the contrary, we see that it is brief and the content we talked about the response when it was positive or negative in all measurements studied.</li> <li>4- The study was on one category, wheat <i>Triticum aestivum</i>, the most cultivated species in my country.</li> <li>5- Ok agree with you at Vitamins were added to the nutrient medium and at the same time treatment to plantlets) also true .</li> <li>6- Yes, we pointed out that the control has a percentage of vitamin and our weakness focus for other treatments</li> <li>7- ok</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There is a lot of typing mistakes. For example: Latin plant names should be written in italics, as <i>Triticum aestivum</i> , <i>Lupinus albus</i> , mistakes in the list of literature, etc.	Yes we corrected
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	