



## PROPAGATION OF ORNAMENTAL PLANTS

Editorial Office, University of Forestry, 10 Kliment Ohridski blvd.,  
Sofia 1756, Bulgaria, Fax: (++ 359 2) 862 28 30, e-mail: ivilievltu@yahoo.com,  
www.journal-pop.org

### CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWERS

**Title of the manuscript:** *IN VITRO* CONSERVATION OF ENDANGERED ORCHID

*Bulbophyllum auricomum* Lindl., THE ROYAL ORCHID OF MYANMAR

**Author (s):** ..... Myo Ma Ma Than<sup>1</sup>.....

**No of the manuscript:** .....751.....

**Deadline for the receiving of your review:** 30 days after the receiving of the manuscript

**Please consider main point A and B. Please DO NOT CONTINUE TO REVIEW the manuscript if:**

**- the answer to point A.1 is YES**

**- the answer to point B is LOW.**

#### **A. Relevance of the paper.**

##### ***1. Previous publication of the material***

☒ No

☐ Yes. What and where.....

#### **B. Scientific and practical importance of the data**

☐ High

☐ Adequate

☒ Low

#### **C. Scientific quality**

##### ***1. Are the data in this manuscript new?***

☒ Yes

☐ No.

Comments:.....

##### ***2. Is the manuscript clearly written and well-organized?***

☐ Yes

X No. Comments: Too long and the structure of the study is not clear according to the headlines used and the factors studied.....

**3. Are the Abstract and the Key words adequate?**

X Yes

☐ No. Suggestions: .....

**4. Does the Introduction state the present knowledge and aim of the research?**

☐ Yes

X No. Comments: .. X too long with too much general information on orchids at all and no explanation why this factors (nutrient concentration, sucrose concentration, light duration were studied

**5. Materials, methods, and study design**

X Adequate

☐ Improvement needed. Suggestions:.....some remarks added.....

☐ Inadequate. Comments: .....!

**6. Results and Discussion**

☐ Properly drawn with regard to methods and data

☐ Should be adjusted – Suggestions: .....

X Insufficiently supported – Comments: ...The description of the results is not clear enough regarding the aim of the study. It seems to me sometimes to read something about micropropagation. Effect of light is nowhere discussed. Why such high PPFD was used and not dim light or even darkness for long term storage? It is also not clear why sucrose and light were investigated for the in vitro stage, while nutrient concentration and sucrose was analyzed for acclimatization stage. For acclimatization no data are presented – only briefly description and pictures there are. Discussion presents information belonging to the introduction and the results are not really discussed.. Finally there is no conclusion whether 12 months are an appropriate period for storage. There is a lot of valuable literature but the use for the discussion is too little.- I mean not the citation but the contents!.....

**7. Are the tables , figures titles, and legends presented well and necessary?**

☐ Yes

☐ Improvement needed.

Suggestions:.....

X No. Comments: ...use the SI standards for the units.....

**8. Data and statistical treatment**

☐ Adequate

X Improvement needed. Comments: For qualitative data (% of survival) Duncans test is not possible – quantitative data are required for it. Chi square would be an alternative.....

☐ Inadequate. Comments: .....

**9. Have all relevant literature been cited**

☒ Yes

☐ No. Suggestions: .....

**D. Recommendations (after corrections)**

☐ The paper should be published as it is now, or with minor editorial changes

☐ The paper could be published after minor revision, and need not be re-reviewed

☒ The paper could be accepted after major revision according to the comments

☐ Rejected

**E. If adjustments or revision is recommended**

☐ The writer is allowed to contact me

☒ I want to be anonymous

☐ I am not willing to review this paper again

☐ I agree to review the manuscript again after the revision

Please add further comments.