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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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 work explores regeneration of three genetic variants/accessions/genotypes of Guinea grass (*Panicum maximum*)The sexual accession(N68/96-8-o-5) and two Apomictic/Non-sexually grown(N68/96-8-o-11 accession & “Natsukaze” variant)). A gene ASG-1(Apomxix specific gene-1)from Apomictic accession N68/96-8-o-11(not cloned here)important in asexual genetics mechanism in plant breeding and hybrid yield** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes the title is proper and correctly identifies the area of focus in the study. Yet a slight improvement for clarity could be: “ Development of an Effiecient Plant regeneration System from Apomectic and Sexual seeds of Guinea Grass (*Paenicum maximum*)”** |  |
| 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 good summary of the research, including aims, study design, methodology, result outcomes, and conclusios. It could be made better by making clear why the outcomes are important to future genetic transformation research, Also a reference to statistical analysis procedures employed would make the abstract clearer like ANOVA, SD, SEM etc.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **Yes the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The methodology is well detailed, and results are presented logically with pictorial and numerical proofs of Like seed sterilization, washing, callus formation from seeds, callus morphologies, and different media in figure 4. As well as plant hardening shooting, rooting, acclimitization to soil. i.e. completely regenerated plantlets are show pictorially.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **There are total 15 references include key studies in plant tissue culture and apomixis research, dated to 1987, 1990’s and 2000’s. There need to be references from 2014-2025, or atleast last five years.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The grammar is generally good, but there’s a few grammatical errors and not-so-good sentences. It requires catious proofreading for understanding and coherence. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The tables and figures/charts do support the text well, but some of the labelling could have been clearer.The research may be enhanced by usefulness of the regeneration system in commercial breeding programmes.**Required slight improvement in language, clarity, and references** |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)* |  |
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