

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118846
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Crop Resilience to Abiotic Stress through Molecular Markers: A Review
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> <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 manuscript is scientifically important because it presents the importance of defining genes that can respond to stresses.</p> <p>2. The title is very good.</p> <p>3. The abstract is short, clear, and concise.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is written to be published as a review paper, so the structure is not in compliance with a typical original article. Anyway, the subsections given cover much of the information that responds well to the title. Anyway, some improvements are needed, as shown below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capitalization is used for common words, so please change that according to the comments given in the reviewed manuscript. - Minor errors were observed with the use of percent and the symbol “%” - Some paragraphs are too short, so please combine them with others. <p>5. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English level is very good, and only a few mistakes in writing were observed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript should be accepted for publication with minor revisions. Anyway, I agree with the decision the editor will make.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia