

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_118453
Title of the Manuscript:	Precision Engineering in Oncology: Advancement and Applications of CRISPR Technology in Murine Cancer Modelling
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The review paper is very well-written that covers the utilization of CRISPR-Cas9 technology in creating precise murine cancer models. The Manuscript provided a comprehensive overview of the background and history of technology, its application in various cancer types and the use of different delivery techniques. Moreover, the authors have also discussed the future potential applications. However, to improve it the authors can consider doing the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In section: Versions of CRISPR-Cas9 System, add a table listing all versions and their applications Similarly, a table summarizing different cancer types and the specific CRISPR strategies used for each can be added under CRISPR Cancer Models to offer a better review to its reader More elaborative details can be added on alternative techniques and comparison to CRISPR-Cas9 like TALENs and ZFNs with details on their limitations. The title of research is descriptive and elaborative and do justice in explaining what the paper is all about. The abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the key aspects of the manuscript. however, more details on future recommendations can be added to increase its effectiveness. The subsections of the manuscript and the structure seems appropriate. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript seems scientifically appropriate as it covers established scientific concepts like CRISPR-Cas9 technology, different versions of Cas9, delivery methods and its applications in cancer research, addresses potential limitations (off-target effects, delivery) and proposes solutions based on existing research (ChIP-seq, purified Cas9 proteins). It also mentions established techniques like lentivirus vectors and inducible Cas9 systems. More specific recent references on murine cancer modelling are missing. 	
<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 appropriate for scholarly articles. However, some sentences are very lengthy and reader lose concentration while reading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The turnitin report shows 60% similarity including bibliography and quoted materials and 27% without. The similarity index should be reduced to below 20%.</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:	Sarah Iqbal
Department, University & Country	Dhofar University, Oman