



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_37858
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth regulators on in vitro multiplication of yellow passion fruit
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	This paper should receive native English review. <u>Title</u>: Effects of cytokinin and auxin on: cytokinin and auxin should be specified in the title. <u>In abstract</u> Aims: "Passiflora edulis f. flavicarpa" should be specified. Results: The absence of: incomplete sentence; the object of "promote" is inappropriate. Conclusion: The results showed in this study are not leading a conclusion about the suitable culture methods. In general, the shoots proliferation and promotion of the rooting should be separately investigate in each medium condition. First of all, the medium condition for shoots proliferation is considered and then the shoots growth and rooting should be investigated. 4.Conclusion Even if the stem elongation is promoted, if the degree of stem proliferation is low, it can not to be said that the optimum medium for proliferation of yellow passion fruit is developed.	The manuscript was reviewed by a native English. TITLE Title changed as requested. IN ABSTRACT The scientific name of the species was added. The results and conclusion were better explained. CONCLUSION The conclusion has been modified for better understanding. FIGURE Changes were made in the figures as requested.
Minor REVISION comments	Figure: all the decimal point should be " . ". Figure1: B,C the legend: "without NAA ($Y=1.68-0.28X$, $R^2=0.8$)" is better. Line100: the highest mean dose was: the highest mean was found in 0.5 mg L^{-1} BAP.... Line 112-113: observed at BAP concentration of $0.5 \rightarrow$ observed at 0.5 mg L^{-1} BAP Line114: the lowest dose did not present a dose difference.... $\rightarrow$ the effect at 0.5 mg L^{-1} did not differ from that at 1.0 mg L^{-1} Line 117: Comparing doses without NAA, a decrease was observed $\rightarrow$ a decrease in the length of shoots was observed Line 119: in the regulator absence $\rightarrow$ in the growth regulator absebece Line 120,130: Anand and co-authors $\rightarrow$ Anand et al. [18] Line 123,128: largest $\rightarrow$ it should be "longest" as shown in the figure 1-E. Line 128: Concerning the mean length of the largest root, the dose did not differ from each other $\rightarrow$ there were no significant differences in the longest root length between the BAP dose	The terms were changed as requested for a better understanding.
Optional/General comments		