



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_44027
Title of the Manuscript:	Whole Plants Regeneration of Cassava Cultivars (Manihot esculenta Crantz) Originated From Côte d'Ivoire Via Somatic Embryogenesis
Type of the 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	<p>The topic is interesting and statistical analysis is relevant to the content. However, materials method should be written in an organised way and make a synchronise with each section.</p> <p>Presented results in Tables and Figure should be discussed clearly. Morphological characteristics are presented in Figure 1. But there is no Bar indicated in figure. Bar should be used in Figure. The characteristics of embryogenic and non-embryogenic should be presented clearly.</p> <p>Discussions are very short and it is not enough for understanding this research results. Authors used several auxin and cytokinin for performing this research, However, the significance of plant growth regulator to cassava and how it works on this regeneration process should be mentioned and discussed more clearly.</p> <p>Scientific name should be written in italic form.</p> <p>Conclusion should be written more precisely and clearly.</p> <p>Some of the corrections indicates in the PDF text.</p>	<p>After having immature leaves on induction medium, two cases are presented to us, we obtain either compact callus so non-embryogenic that we do not use and therefore we do not evaluate and embryogenic callus, We just put in this work a non-embryogenic callus image, the work has focused on embryogenic calli that have undergone regular subcultures to evolve into an cotyledonary embryo</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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)	