Although the ms is in the scope of the journal and scanty literature is available for micropropagation of *Drosera intermedia*, this reviewer can’t recommend the publication of this work. I am sorry for that, but I found many constraints which prevent to accept this work.

* Firstly, the originality of this paper is questionable. Gevenstuk et al. (2010) pointed out a simple and efficient protocol for the micropropagation of *Drosera intermedia* by using cultures initiated from *in vitro* produced seedlings; in this work , shoot proliferation was significantly influenced by Murashige and Skoog (MS) macronutrient concentration and higher multiplication rates were reached for ¼ MS ratio, kinetin being proved do not enhance the multiplication efficiency. An average 15.8 plantlets per initial shoot was produced after 8 weeks of culture and this values are higher compared to those described in the present work.
* Although the authors state that the goal of the present paper is to provide an efficient micropropagation protocol for *Drosera intermedia*, no protocol is outlined at the end of the experimental trials; the authors simply provide some observations on growth which, in addition, is not a true novelty for this species.
* The material and methods section is not satisfactory. It is unclear the mineral concentration used when different sucrose levels are used; it is unclear the sucrose concentration used when different salt strength are used, no information are provided on the media used at different pH levels. The same is when different growth regulators are tested: it is unclear the salt formulation and the sucrose concentration. It is unclear why the authors specified the concentration of myo-inositol: didn’t they use the MS formulation? Also the measured variables are not so clear. Do the authors intend to assess the multiplication efficiency? If it is, why the roots per plants are scored? Why did they told us about the rooting percentage? Did they consider that sucrose beside its role under metabolic point of view covers an important function as osmotic agent? It is very scanty the observation made after the acclimatization phase: how did the plantlets perform according to the different treatments?
* Many not shown data are reported in the Results section and the discussion part is really scanty and doesn’t provide any relevant news whixh are valuable under a scientific and applicable point of view.