

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116641
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovative Reproductive Technology in Animal Breeding: A Review
Type of the Article	Review

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"> 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Revolutionizing Animal Breeding: A Look at Innovative Reproductive Technologies Abstract not comprehensive and it need improvement No Yes Not sufficient 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In-depth analysis should be done, focusing on the benefits and potential drawbacks of RTs</p> <p>Attached as tract changes in the document. The document can be reorganized for better flow. You can start with the importance of genetic improvement in livestock for a growing population. Then, discuss the challenges faced and how RTs address them. Finally, explain the specific technologies used. Tables and figures are not linked with text. Review lacks a critical analysis of the different methods for estrus detection. It doesn't discuss limitations or compare the effectiveness of each method. Check minor grammatical errors. Review focuses heavily on the benefits. Briefly mentioning potential drawbacks (e.g., animal welfare concerns, ethical considerations) would provide a more balanced view. RTs address some infertility issues, they don't overcome all problems. Additionally, breeding distant species is highly complex and ethically debated. If discussing breeding distant species, touch on the ethical considerations.</p> <p>AI section; Add a section that discusses limitations of AI. Consider mentioning potential drawbacks like lower success rates compared to natural mating, reliance on skilled technicians, and potential disease transmission risks if proper protocols are not followed.</p> <p>Inconsistent and incomplete citations and references.</p> <p>Sexed Semen Technology: Add a section that analyzes sperm sexing technology. Discuss limitations like reduced sperm viability after sorting, potential for ethical concerns, and its economic feasibility.</p> <p>Cryopreservation: Discuss limitations like potential damage to cells during freezing/thawing, success rate variations, and the infrastructure required for storage in liquid nitrogen. Briefly mention alternative methods for semen and embryo storage (non-cryogenic)</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:	Kiplangat Ngeno
Department, University & Country	Moi University, Kenya