

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121117
Title of the Manuscript:	Wild genetic resource in vegetable improvement: applications and strategies
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 highlight 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>This topic is crucial given the increasing global food demand and the challenges posed by climate change and pest resistance. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on practical strategies like bridge crosses, somatic hybridization, and grafting, which offer valuable insights for researchers and breeders working in the field of agricultural science.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>appropriate and effectively captures the essence of the manuscript</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>It could benefit from a more structured approach, briefly mentioning the key findings or recommendations from the review. Additionally, the abstract could emphasize the importance of conserving wild genetic resources, which is touched upon in the manuscript but not highlighted in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is divided into clear sections that guide the reader through the background, challenges, strategies, and applications of wild genetic resources in vegetable improvement. Each section builds on the previous one, providing a coherent flow of information.</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>The scientific reasoning is solid, and the discussion is supported by relevant examples from the literature. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more critical discussion of the potential drawbacks or limitations of these strategies, as well as their applicability to different vegetable crops.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>There may be a need to include more recent references from the past 3-5 years to ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest advancements in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally clear, but there are several instances where the text could be improved for better readability. For example, the abstract could be rewritten to be more concise and structured. Some sections, particularly the introduction and conclusion, could be streamlined to avoid repetition. There are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need correction. A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. Some notes are available in the attached manuscript file.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I recommend minor revisions. The manuscript is strong in its content and scientific rigor but would benefit from improvements in language, structure, and the inclusion of more recent references. With these revisions, the manuscript will be well-positioned to make a significant contribution to the field of vegetable crop improvement.</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:	Hussein J. Shareef
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq