

Journal Name:	<a href="#">PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PCBMB_12521
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Crop Resilience Through CRISPR-Mediated Modification of Defense-Related Genes
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>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>
<b>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.</b>	As stated in the article, it is very important "...Developing resilient crops with strong defense mechanisms is crucial to guarantee sustainable agricultural production in the face of these challenges..." Studying different genotypes, crops and those that are resistant to pests and drawbacks several. Further research can be done with fertilizers of organic origin, without contaminating components and with NPK of organic origin such as digestates. It is recommended to continue the research using different types of fertilizers and observe the results.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is correct, and it also complies: The title must be brief, concise and clear.	

<p><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></p>	<p>The abstract provides an overview of the body of work.  The abstract has a correct length.  It may contain the answer to questions such as: why was the study carried out? What was done and how? What are the results? What do these findings mean and what impact do they have?  The summary can be structured with the sections: objective, design, setting, themes, results and conclusions or unstructured, in which the information is usually given in two or three paragraphs.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure is not correct. The correct titles would be: Introduction, materials and methods, results and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>It can be considered a well-formed and structured manuscript.  The tables should be mentioned in the text where appropriate, as well as in their title.  The same goes for the figures. They should be written in the text and in the footer of the figure or table.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The bibliography is correct, it covers the last 10 years. The number of references is also correct. Unify the reference indentation is different in some.  A good bibliographical work.</p>	

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations... As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Noé Anes García</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Oviedo, Spain</b>