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| Date: | 23 Jul 2016 |
| To: | "Wansang Lim" wanaaaa@gmail.com |
| From: | "Plant Cell, Tissue & Organ Culture (PCO)" Renuka.Nidhi@springer.com |
| Subject: | Major Revisions requested PCTO-D-16-00226R1 |
| Dear Dr Lim,  We have received the reports from our advisors on your manuscript, "Co-expression of onion chalcone isomerase in Del/Ros1-expressing tomato enhances anthocyanin and flavonol production", which you submitted to Plant Cell, Tissue and Organ Culture (PCTOC): Journal of Plant Biotechnology.  Based on the advice received, I feel that your manuscript could be reconsidered for publication should you be prepared to incorporate major revisions.  When preparing your revised manuscript, you are asked to carefully consider the reviewer comments which are attached.  In order to submit your revised manuscript, please access the following web site:  http://pcto.edmgr.com/  Your username is: \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Your password is: \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript within eight weeks.  Please make sure to submit your editable source files (i. e. Word, TeX).  Yours sincerely  Sergio J Ochatt, Ph.D. Editor in Chief Plant Cell, Tissue and Organ Culture (PCTOC): Journal of Plant Biotechnology  COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:  Editor-in-Chief: When the revised manuscript arrived I had several concerns about the revision undertaken and decided to send it again to the handling Asociate Editor before making a final decision. The AE also found that a major revision is required, again, before this manuscript may become eventually acceptable for publication. All queries below must be taken care of in this new revision or the fate of this submission would clearly be in jeopardy.  Associate Editor: After revising this new version, I still have some doubts about Figure 5 and the way they rewrote the discussion. This is why I asked again the reviewers for opinion. Reviewers agree with this view. Although the authors increased the font size and improved the alignment of the designations below the bars in Fig. 5, we are still concerned about the format.  When the size of the figure is decreased for publication format, it seems to me the compression of those thin bars is going to make it difficult to distinguish.  Plus there are still some alignment issues.  The letters indicating the significance differences are not in exact alignment with some of the bars.   In addition, there needs to be more spece between the upper and lower bar graphs because the 0, 10, 0.0 and 0.8 coordinates are on top of each other.  The discussion still needs revision.  There is still a problem with the flow and too much information from the results is repeated in the discussion.  They should certainly not be referring to figures.  We wonder if they had anyone with manuscript writing experience review their manuscript before submission.  In conclusion, we would strongly recommend the authors to take these suggestion seriously and address the issues raied properly in order to have the manuscript finally accepted.     \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* | |