

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98019
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Rapid Generation Advancement (RGA) in crop improvement
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The work presented is of importance in the agricultural field; however, you must take care of the form, style, syntax and give order and coherence to what is intended to be demonstrated, in addition to avoiding repeating information. Review and consider that when the abbreviations appear for the first time, they should at the same time highlight what each of these is about.</p> <p>2. The title of the work seems appropriate.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, taking care of the order of each "section" and of ideas.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are well marked, however the numbering presented in the manuscript must be reviewed (without numbering), taking care of the style.</p> <p>5. The work can be improved both in substance and in the form of writing.</p> <p>6. References appear to be sufficient; however, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references.</p> <p>Review the writing of information, on the document errors and conditions are marked (colored) that the authors must review, analyze and make the corresponding changes. It is recommended to avoid etc.</p> <p>Review the conclusions, give them order, coherence and be concise, considering which conclusions are really those that emanate from the manuscript.</p> <p>Review and complete the information corresponding to the marked references (since they are incomplete- two of them).</p> <p>Additionally, it is recommended that when abbreviations appear (the meaning appears in parentheses; it should not be taken for granted, since the reader must at all times know what each abbreviation refers to).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A minor revision is required regarding the writing of English.</p> <p>Where available, the URLs of the references are provided. The text must comply with the style and bibliographic requirements described in the guidelines for authors.</p> <p>The document presents some writing details (order, syntax, style) on which it is suggested to review and work</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3].</p> <p>Necessary suggestions to carry out</p> <p>Reference to a journal:</p> <p>1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p>Reference to a book:</p> <p>2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p> <p>Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles.</p> <p>3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work: This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of The State of Mexico, México