

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122459</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE ROLE OF BIOTECHNOLOGY IN THE FUTURE OF FRUIT CROP PRODUCTION: A REVIEW</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript effectively encapsulates the transformative potential of biotechnology in the realm of fruit crop production, emphasizing its relevance to critical global issues such as food security, climate change, and sustainability. The abstract is well-structured, highlighting key biotechnological advancements like genetic engineering, marker-assisted selection, and CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing, and their contributions to improving yield, quality, and resilience in fruit crops.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Here are some new topics related to role of biotechnology in future of fruit crop. ΔThe Role of Biotechnology in enhancing Nutritional valueand Food security in Fruit Crop.	
<b>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.</b>	Overall, this abstract is well-written and covers the essential aspects of how biotechnology can revolutionize fruit crop production. With a few refinements, it could become even more impactful in conveying the significance of these advancements to a broad audience.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Well structured	
<b>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.</b>	The mention of regulatory, ethical, and public acceptance challenges adds a critical dimension to the discussion, recognizing that technological advancements must be accompanied by appropriate frameworks to ensure their successful adoption and by suggesting future research directions, particularly the integration of multi-omics technologies, the abstract acknowledges the need for continued innovation and a deeper understanding of complex trait mechanisms.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	These references are periodically recent and sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Firdous Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Govt Degree College, India</b>