

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Botany</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIB_12612</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Advancements and Foresight of Accelerated Nuclear DNA Equipment for Rapid DNA Analysis</b>
Type of the 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://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy> )

### 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>
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>Beneficial. Gives a short review of the instruments function, its application and limitations.</b>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>yes</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 needs work. Make it more concise.</b> - Para 2 same as last line in paragraph 1. - STR – Short Tandem Repeat Analysis	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>8. ADVANCEMENT OF ANDE 6C SYSTEM – include this portion, in the earlier part of the paper.</b></li> <li>- IS it ANDE 6c or ANDE 6C, check keep same all over the paper</li> <li>- <b>The ANDE 6c was operated by first responders in tents placed proximal to the mock disaster sites manuscript submitted [7, 9].</b> What manuscript submission is being talked about.</li> <li>- <b>The ANDE 6C Rapid DNA Act of 2017 – Specify that this act has been passed in the USA.</b></li> <li>- <b>Recently, fully automated rapid DNA systems have been developed, and the accreditation outcomes of the ANDE 6C Rapid DNA Identification System for reference sample typing are presented here [8]. – 'Here' means were. This is from reference 8. Make proper corrections in paper.</b></li> <li>- <b>Page 3 last line repeated thrice.</b></li> <li>- <b>Page 7 para 3- specify the country in which the study was performed in.</b></li> <li>- <b>Point 7.3 – elaborate more on quantification with reference to used reference paper 27.</b></li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 13 last para. Which document is being referred to?</li> </ul>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference 2 and reference 27 are the same. Why. Also, more authors are named how?</li> </ul>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Should be better</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Correct the conclusion – remember the ANDE 6C system does not perform well with complicated DNA sources/ samples and in samples with low DNA. Though the authors are trying to finish the paper on a positive note , give it a different end instead of its performance capacity. Scratch the last line.</li> <li>- Comment on profile reproducibility and loss of sample that takes place since the system uses all of the available samples. Also put a note on degraded samples though the authors are repeatedly commenting on DVI samples. Let there be a comment on degraded samples at least in conclusion.</li> <li>- The paper seems haphazardly put at places. Make sure the manuscript is read again properly by the authors.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Neha Bhale</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>India</b></p>