

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_84493
Title of the Manuscript:	Chromosomal Engineering through CRISPR–Cas Technology: A way forward
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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript provides a detailed and exhaustive review of the state of the art and perspectives on chromosomal engineering using CRISPR Cas technology, as this represent the next step on massive genetic editing. Figures are well designed, and references properly cited. The overall manuscript represents a high-level review on the field.	All the suggestions of reviewer are considered. All the mistakes have been corrected. The recommendations by reviewers are very appreciable. It has helped a lot in improving this manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	In the original manuscript you will find a very few annotations, mostly related to typos, they are highlighted in yellow (Uppercase, italics, etc). Please addressed them properly.  There is an observation regarding the work of Beying et al, (page 8 bottom), where authors provide a certain percentage of translocation efficiency and other values, whereas the original work indicates slightly a different percentage and values. This difference did NOT invalidate authors' statements and conclusions, and perhaps the discrepancy is only related to different interpretation. Please look at it.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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