

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130628
Title of the Manuscript:	SOMACLONAL VARIANTS IN ORNAMENTALS
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of somaclonal variation as one of the ornamental plant breeding methods is a good choice considering the high heterozygous nature of the plant. This method can produce new plant variants faster compared to conventional breeding methods.	Thank you for your thoughtful comment and for recognizing the significance of somaclonal variation in ornamental plant breeding. We appreciate your insights on its advantages, especially in accelerating the development of new plant variants compared to conventional breeding methods. Your encouragement reinforces the importance of our research, and we are grateful for your support.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	ok	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is still too vague so it does not adequately describe the contents of the manuscript.	Thank you for your feedback. We appreciate your suggestion and will refine the abstract to provide a clearer and more detailed summary of the manuscript. We will ensure that it explicitly outlines the research objectives, key findings, methodologies, and significance to better reflect the study's content. Your input is valuable in improving the clarity and comprehensiveness of our work.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Ok	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	references are not up to date. Look for references from research results from the last 5 years	Thank you for your valuable feedback. We acknowledge the importance of incorporating recent references to ensure our work reflects the latest advancements in the field. We will carefully review and update our reference list, incorporating relevant studies from the last five years to strengthen the credibility and relevance of our manuscript. Your suggestion is greatly appreciated.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	