

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_108676
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Future of Plant Breeding: Advancements and Challenges
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript provides an overview of the advances in plant breeding and genetics over the years, and also touches upon the future possibilities and challenges.</p> <p>The title is acceptable.</p> <p>The abstract is acceptable.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript, although promising, appears more like a technical bulletin rather than a scientific review paper.</p> <p>No, in my opinion, the references are too few for a review paper. In addition, more than 25% of the cited references are more than 10 years old. Suggestions have been provided in the objective evaluation section (Part 4).</p> <p>Additional comments have been included in the objective evaluation section (Part 4).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is acceptable. However, the authors are suggested to carefully proofread the manuscript to avoid some minor issues (A suggestion as an example has been provided in the objective evaluation section (Part 4)).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments have been provided in the objective evaluation section (Part 4).</p> <p>Justification: The manuscript, as a review paper, has referred to too few studies; only 26 references are included, which I feel is too less for a review paper. In addition, seven of those references are more than 10 years old. Even though a sufficient discussion of the background is required, I suggest the authors should comprehensively revise the review. They should refer to sufficiently more number of papers on the recent advances in this field.</p> <p>Furthermore, the manuscript reads more like a technical bulletin rather than a scientific review. The authors should delve into the scientific depth of the various techniques that they have included. At present, these read more like textbook/handbook-suitable content, rather than a scientific review.</p> <p>The manuscript can be a interesting and informative read if the authors address the above-mentioned issues.</p> <p>In addition, I will suggest the authors to carefully proofread the manuscript. I observed a few minor proofreading errors (Abbreviations once defined, should be used consistently throughout the manuscript; they need not be defined again, e.g., MAS has been defined twice.)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Manigopa Chakraborty
Department, University & Country	Birsa Agricultural University, India