

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129369
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Review on Application of Conventional and Mutation Approaches in Genetic Improvement of Ornamental Crops
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Mutation breeding is a powerful tool for generating novel variations in plants. A well-structured mutation breeding program can efficiently yield desirable traits, which can subsequently be developed into new mutant varieties. This review aims to assist breeders in selecting the most appropriate mutagenesis methods to achieve optimal results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It's adequate and well aligned	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, It is a nicely written manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient. But I also recommend some of my work to cite. 1. Harish Kumar, S.M. Ghawade and Shivaputra. 2018. Evaluation of Gamma Radiation Induced Morphological Mutants in Dolichos Bean (<i>Lablab purpureus</i> L.) in M2 Generation. <i>The Bioscan</i> 13(4): 863-868 2. Harish Kumar, Shivaputra, M. L. Meghwal and S. M. Ghawade. 2017. Effect of Gamma Radiations on Yield and Yield Attributing Characters of Dolichos Bean (<i>Lablab purpureus</i> L.) in M2 Generation. <i>Indian Journal of Ecology</i> 44(4): 182-185 2017	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, It is sufficient but need some improvement. (Mentioned in general comments)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are some minor corrections which are also mentioned as comments in manuscript. Some of the marked sentences are poorly written. Aurther started some of the discussions abruptly. The flow of the discussion can be improved. The refences are replaced by numbers which are creating difficulties in reading the review. Botanical/scientific names should be in italics. A brief reading and some adjustments will increase the value of the article. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harish Kumar
Department, University & Country	Arni University, India