



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_49096
Title of the Manuscript:	Plant Hybridization As An Alternative Technique To Genetic Engineering: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This REVIEW manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Abstract, Introduction, Body of text, Conclusion and References are all of acceptable standard.</p> <p>However, there can still be room for up-grading this work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Topic was not justified to be appropriate in the write up of this manuscript as Genetic Engineering was neither defined nor explained in at least a paragraph. Only 'molecular markers, transgenic approach' are seen in the <i>Keywords</i>. Suggest Topic as – Plant Hybridization as an Alternative Technique in Plant Breeding Improvement Within the text or body of this write up, references could be put in square brackets as – [1] and [2,5] as required for this Journal (AJRCS). REFERENCES at the end of this work could also be arranged in the format accepted for this Journal. There is need to carefully check through and re-write most of the references. Example, In Lines 341-342, Actual name of International symposium was not given. In Lines 400- 401; 415 – 417; 424 – 425; 434 – 435; 441 – 444; 517 - 518 – names of the Journals are not given. Author(s) are expected to have downloaded and read through most of the references cited in a REVIEW work, So that references are proper and well cited. 	Noted and corrected
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In Line 2: Could be put as- ABSTRACT In Lines 18, 283, 298: <i>in situ</i> could be in italics as <i>in situ</i> In Line 21: Could insert 'plant' as – of plant breeding. Line 24 and 25: Could be <i>Key words: Hybridization, reproductive barriers, molecular markers, transgenic approach</i> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 28: Could change 'modem' plant to modern plant Line 54: Could put 'full stop' as – generation. Line 124: Could be – Some previous researchers [26] once obtained Line 148: Could be – is advantageous Line 151: Could be – di-electrophoresis; Line 200: Could be - research has shown that heterosis Line 218: Could be - of reduced gamete Line 247: Could be – <i>Indica sp.</i> and <i>Japonica sp.</i> cross Line 310: Could be - 3. CONCLUSION Line 311: Could be - non-transgenic approaches in crop Line 315: '[92]' reference could be deleted from within the CONCLUSION 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	More effort could be put in to still improve on this noble work.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>