

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123041
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive Overview of Plant Germplasm Augmentation: Strategies, Techniques, and Applications
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>To make it more relevant to contemporary issues and technological changes, more critical appraisals should have been included. Authors are obliged to make this work different from other reviews through including unique data, case studies, or some critical views about the emerging challenges faced in this area (such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and geopolitical factors).</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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 generally comprehensive; that is, it gives a broad overview of what is contained in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally well-organized and follows a logical structure that supports the development of the exposition. However, a number of aspects could be improved upon for greater clarity and readability. At present, there is much information within the text that can be regarded as very basic knowledge found in any textbook-for instance, extended descriptions of general collection methods and breeding system for germplasm collection. These sections could be condensed or briefly referenced.</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>This manuscript is more a review of a large amount of material, without innovation or challenging the paradigms. The technologies and strategies are all well-known, compiled into one single work, but nothing new is brought forth, nor does it criticize existing methodologies. The tone at this point should be more tilted toward critical analyses of the various strategies' effectiveness. For instance, the discussion on GIS should be done in light of its limitations with respect to cost and accessibility in resource-limited settings. The use of artificial intelligence and machine learning should be explored. The manuscript mentions in vitro techniques, but it does not address their practical challenges regarding high costs, technical expertise requirements, and genetic drift in long-term cultures.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language is appropriate for scholarly communications; still, some parts could be even more clear and concise to secure ease of reading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript may be considered for publication, but major revisions are needed. The authors are advised to avoiding unnecessary content from textbooks, and critically discussing the methods presented.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Prashant Yadav
Department, University & Country	India