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| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | While the references are relevant, many are older than five years, making the review outdated. There are few citations of recent studies on homeogenomics, particularly in computational genomics and homeobox gene-related therapeutic strategies. To strengthen the manuscript, the authors should replace older references with more recent studies (post-2020) and add at least 5–6 new references focusing on computational genomics and recent advances in homeobox gene therapy. |  |
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