



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39558
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of 2,4-D growth regulator and foliar explant source on the <i>Coffea arabica</i> embryogenic callus
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Figure 1: presented the results as the all leaf discs have reacted the same way. Here a distribution of the leaf discs from 0, 100% with time will be appropriated. Figure 2: number of potentially embryogenic calli: per Petri or what???? (not clear to me) Even though the plant regeneration technique by somatic embryogenesis	OK. Figure 2 represents a total amount of all potentially embryonic calli produced in all leaf explants from each treatment (all petri from each treatment). OK. We appreciate your feedback. Your comments are relevant and and all suggestions were accepted. Your comment (PDF) " could you presented a comparative results of these four morphological characteristics in your treatments. that will be interesting the responses of each treatment". Replay: The non-embryogenic calli appear with great frequency in all treatments. Unfortunately, we do not count. The experiment was very big, so we prioritize the embryogenic calli.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting comparison study with great contribution to coffee propagation. Quite good presentation of results and discussion. See highlighting in the manuscript.	We appreciate your review. Your comments are relevant and and all suggestions were accepted.