**Dear Editor and Dear Authors,**

**I found that revisions were made in the new version of the ms and, obviously, this is a positive approach to improve the work. Notwithstanding of it, I am really sorry to say that the required standard to publish in the journal was not achieved.**

**Following, some more comments.**

**1- The Abstract is not adequate. I tried to make revisions on it as a suggestion for the authors**

**2- The Introduction part has been improved but the authors state that few reports have been already done for somatic embryogenesis from root derived calli in Lilium. These references should be clearly cited and the authors should specify the differences with the present work**

**3- The Materials and Methods part is still poor. I have some general comments on it and some specific remarks. The authors should clearly definy the different phases: callus induction- somatic embryos regeneration- somatic embryos conversion into plantlets and for each phase explain the media, conditions and parameters which were taken into account to assess the efficiency of the phase. Beside this general observations, still some details should be specified (e.g. kind of closure) and overall the English form should be still improved.**

**4- I don’t think that the experiment made to compare the efficiency of callus formation from bulb scale, leaf and root tissue is relevant. In reality the authors provide us only the percentage of callus formation but no data on somatic embryos regeneration have been done. The whole paper is addressed to study the efficiency of somatic embryogenesis protocol when root tissues are used.**

**5- In the Results section I found that many sentences from material and methods are repeated. In this section the authors should clearly show the results without saying again how the experiment was done. Again many parts should be improved in their English form. I did not find any quantitative data on callus formation (e.g. fresh and dry weight, water content) and this seems poor to make this paper considered for publication as a research paper. In the previous version, The authors stated something more. Is it not possible to have some more data and to organize it in a revised form of this paper? It is not correct to say that the best performance for palntlets conversion was on MS + CPPU; the authors did only this medium. What about the percentage of converted plantlets?**

**6- Tables are confusing. I found more clear the previous ones; for the reader it is difficult to follow medium A, B, C….. it is better to have the specification of growth regulators and the concentrations.**

**As previously said, I am at disposal for giving further comments and help to the authors, but, I am really sorry, as presently cast the paper cannot be accepted for publication.**