

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12780
Title of the Manuscript:	Applications of Artificial Polyploid Induction for Genetic Improvement of Plants
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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>

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>
	Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	
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.	This review manuscript presents significant findings that advance our understanding of Applications of Artificial Polyploid Induction for Genetic Improvement of Plants . The rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis contribute valuable insights to the field, making it a noteworthy addition to the scientific literature. I appreciate the authors' clear presentation of their results and the implications for future research. However, I believe that further discussion on	

	<p>antimiotic agents impact and which is better for genetic improvement could enhance the manuscript's impact even more. Overall, this work is a commendable effort that will likely stimulate further investigation and dialogue within the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is generally suitable as it reflects the main focus of the research.</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>The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could benefit from some enhancements. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindly check spelling and grammatical words. 2. Adding a sentence on the implications of the findings would strengthen the abstract's relevance. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>This review manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous methodology and thorough data analysis. The authors employ appropriate antimiotic agents with his effects on plants by using different experimental techniques with established standards in the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and encompass key studies relevant to the topic. However, to strengthen the literature review, I recommend including some recent studies from the past few years that may provide additional insights or support for the findings. Specifically, references that address emerging trends or recent advancements in the field would enhance the manuscript's depth. Including a mix of foundational and contemporary works will ensure a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter</p>	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are areas that could benefit from clarification and refinement. Some sentences could be rephrased for improved readability, and occasional grammatical errors or awkward phrasing should be addressed. Overall, with minor revisions, the manuscript can achieve a more polished and professional tone.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Avinash Shivaji Jondhale
Department, University & Country	MJM Arts Commerce and Science College Karnajli Nashik, India