

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103568
Title of the Manuscript:	GENOME EDITING TECHNOLOGY IN FISHES-a Review
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The projected minireview article is scientifically comprehensible, it is clear, however some parts need to be reworked. This high spot massive probable work for using genome editing in aquaculture to create novel kinds with desirable features. So gene silencing and genome DNA editing have the potential and significant impact on aquatic animal treatment in the future.</p> <p>Yes title of the review article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes the abstract of the review article is scientifically coherent.</p> <p>The subsection part may add more reference work, need to go through review before being published.</p> <p>Image quality and data ok.</p> <p>In the reference cite, the serial No 5, 7, 16, and 22 are given, however, these reference not found in the text, Some details are highlighted in the text in the attached file. It is up to the authors and others reviewer to decide whether accept or not accept them.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, I recommend accept the mini review article after making the minor correction in the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good work</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suday Prasad
Department, University & Country	Bhola Paswan Shastri Agricultural College, Bihar Agricultural University, India