

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116608
Title of the Manuscript:	Genomic advancement in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.): Harnessing Technological Breakthroughs for Future Strategies
Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <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 manuscript is important for scientific community. It explains genetics and genomics in wheat discussing the past, present, and projecting into the future.</p> <p>Yes the title is ok</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but needs to be outlined properly</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are ok. All that is needed some clarifications as highlighted in my attached comments</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>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>Line 22: Five keywords</p> <p>Line 28: Replace productivity with production</p> <p>Line 29: Replace New with new</p> <p>Line 35: Recast the statement</p> <p>Lines 45 and 46: Replace we with they</p> <p>Line 60: Incomplete statement</p> <p>Line 64: Replace to with for</p> <p>Line 77: Replace for with in</p> <p>Line 79: Remove however</p> <p>Line 83: Nevertheless, the efficiency of the process was quite poor</p> <p>Line 86: Compared</p> <p>Line 102: Reference "Peng et al., 1999a wrongly placed</p> <p>Lines 109 to 112 is a repetition of lines 106 to 109</p> <p>Line 113: Fig 1 should be under the diagram</p> <p>Lines 114 to 117 missing thus making line 118 disconnected</p> <p>Line 158: replace through with though</p> <p>Line 169: Functions of genes</p> <p>Line 183: The 21 chromosomes</p> <p>Line 186: The whole</p> <p>Line 202: Great quality</p> <p>Line 208: Chinese</p> <p>Line 215: Italice "Triticum turgidum"</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:	Adebusuyi Tosin Adewumi
Department, University & Country	Augustine University, Nigeria