

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Current Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12731
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Karyotyping in Forestry Species: A Vital Tool for Genetic and Conservation Studies</b>
Type of the Article	

### **PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Biotechnological tools hold importance for animal as well as plant based research. Karyotyping is an important cytogenetic method for study of evolutionary, phylogenetic as well as conservation based study. The theme of manuscript is contemporary and useful for forest conservation.	The introduction section covers all the points related to karyotyping in species evolution, taxonomical classification, and how it helps in evolutionary relationships. A citation has also been added. Conclusion part has been tried to revise.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes. This is because it contains all the vital and reliable information about the article.

<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>	Abstract should be able to give us an insight about the content of the article. Unfortunately author has failed to cover that aspect in the abstract. Ideally he could add atleast 5-6 sentence describing the article via his abstract starting like..."Current article deals with....." . Abstract is the zist of any manuscript so it is advised to author to rewrite abstract covering the matter of the manuscript .	Abstract has been revised as per the comments received from reviewer.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes	According to the authors, the manuscript is scientifically correct. There is no such study which summarizes the work related to karyotyping in forestry species.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	More references need to be added	More references has been added

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English quality needs improvisation.</p>	<p>This point has also been taken into consideration. The language used in this article are simple and easy use understand for the readers.</p>
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p><u>NOTE- please find the edited manuscript with corrections suggested at the end of the document</u></p> <p><u>Reviewer's comment</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Honestly the manuscript is not very appealing and there is lot of scope to make it more readable and informative.</li> <li>2. The manuscript needs to be improvised with respect to grammar, language and content.</li> <li>3. This article is a review article, so I advise to enhance few more subheadings to the article like "Protocols of common karyotypic methods used in forestry", "Future roadmaps", "Constraints and scope in the feasibility of the method".</li> <li>4. The Subheading "Method" could be more clearly written by taking one method of karyotyping at a time under the subheading. And if the content is kept brief, it could be in tabular form.</li> <li>5. A good review has maximum reference articles cited. So more number of research articles/ Scientific article could be read and then accordingly included in the content of the article such that number of recent references would increase.</li> <li>6. By incorporating point number 5, the article will become more informative thereby increasing the citation value of the article.</li> <li>7. Content under the subheading "APPLICATIONS" is</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lots of changes has been made to make it more readable and informative.</li> <li>2. All the points has been covered.</li> <li>3. Protocols for banding patterns and other points for the improvisation has also been done.</li> <li>4. The different methods of karyotyping added in the article has been reviewed and are written clearly by taking one method at a time.</li> <li>5. More references as per the article's demand has been added.</li> <li>6. This point has been taken under consideration.</li> <li>7. The subheading "IMPORTANCE" have been written significantly and the informations are added as per the requirement.</li> <li>8. The suggestions mentioned in the document have been thoroughly examined and corrected as per suggested.</li> </ol>

	<p>written very badly. Please rewrite it. Also I could see that this subheading had more to do with review of literature rather the application. So please edit and improvise the section to fit to subheading “Applications or change the title of subheading.</p> <p>8. Please incorporate the suggestions mentioned in document MS_JSRR_129955 which have been suggested as reviewer's comment on the right in comment boxes throughout the document.</p> <p>FINAL DECISION- Article could be accepted conditionally only after above mentioned comments, 1-10 are incorporated and the article is edited in accordance to above instructions.</p>	
--	---	--

## **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>	No ethical issues were identified in this manuscript.