

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125699
Title of the Manuscript:	CRISPR-Cas9: A cutting-edge genome-editing technology with many potential applications
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Importance of the manuscript: The review article titled "CRISPR-Cas9: A cutting-edge genome-editing technology with many potential applications" has manifold importance for the scientific community since CRISPR/Cas-9 system has been found to be universally accepted gene editing tools used for variety of biological research, mainly for medical purpose. Recent advances in TALEN-CART research in the solid tumor fused with CRISPR technology has proved to be successful in tracing the cancer genes in solid tumors.</p> <p>Liking of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current review has been found to give the insight details of the CRISPR in a well planned manner and is highly recommended for publication. 2. Furthermore, the figures incorporated helps in understanding the mechanism of action of CRISPR 3. The abstract is well defined with considerable number of references. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is fine and goes well with the text of the manuscript. Writing the title as "CRISPR-Cas9: A cutting-edge genome-editing tools and technology with many potential applications" may sound more robust and clear and shall go well with the content of the manuscript. Incorporating the "tools and technology" may sound best.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive and exhaustive, emphasizing the importance of the manuscript and also mentioning its application in different sectors.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Scientific correctness of the current manuscript: Discussing the scientific quench of the given manuscript suggest the topics as mentioned are relevant to the text of the review. CRISPR being a tested genetic editing tool and practiced worldwide particularly in onco research has a wider acceptance and is the recent topic to be included as a review article.</p> <p>Scientific robustness and technicality of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After reading the manuscript it gives me the impression that the review is exhaustive and includes the basic information pertaining to the genetic editing feature of CRISPR/Cas-9 system. 2. The application part is well written and covered all the aspects of the application related to the CRISPR/Cas-9 system 3. Discussion of the structure is written with advance information. 4. Conclusion is written appropriately. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Yes, the reference is comprehensive and covers the entire portion where reference is to be mentioned. I shall expect more reference to be included in the bibliography section since it is a review article and most review are based on more recent references. Hence it would be wise for the author to include more references in the bibliography to the minimum of almost to 100.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language proficiency is good, but should be more lucid if possible. It is optional.	
Optional/General comments	The general comment on this manuscript is that the topic selected for review is most recent and advances in this field is promising and hence the manuscript bears scientific importance.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arup Ratan Biswas
Department, University & Country	Techno India University, India