

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_12612
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancements and Foresight of Accelerated Nuclear DNA Equipment for Rapid DNA Analysis
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it explores significant advancements in rapid DNA analysis technology, particularly its potential to revolutionize forensic science by enabling timely, on-site DNA profiling. It provides key insights into how real-time decision-making can enhance criminal investigations. The balanced discussion of both the advantages and limitations, along with future improvement prospects, makes it a useful resource for researchers and practitioners.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<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>	The abstract presents a clear and informative overview of the accelerated nuclear DNA equipment 6c Rapid Deoxyribonucleic Acid Analysis System and highlights its significance in the field of forensic science. However, the abstract could benefit from improved clarity and conciseness. For instance, certain phrases are repetitive, such as the two similar statements regarding the review's aim to emphasize advancements, advantages, and limitations. Additionally, the mention of "internal emphasis" is unclear and could be revised to better reflect the intended purpose of the review. The challenges and limitations are appropriately addressed, though more detailed suggestions for future improvements (e.g., in terms of software optimization and electropherogram analysis) could be expanded for a more balanced discussion. Finally, a more structured conclusion that directly ties the future perspectives to the current limitations would strengthen the abstract's impact.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections are generally appropriate and well-organized. It covered both technical and practical aspects, providing a comprehensive view of the topic. However, consider renaming "Advantage" to "Advantages" for consistency and clarity.	
<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>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, offering a comprehensive analysis of the ANDE 6C Rapid DNA Analysis System. It provides a clear overview of the system's capabilities and a well-documented working procedure, allowing for accurate assessment of its processes. By referencing previous studies, it reinforces the system's reliability in forensic applications. The balanced discussion of both advantages and limitations adds to its scientific integrity, providing a realistic view of the technology. Largely, the structured approach makes the manuscript highly relevant to the forensic and scientific community.	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	The manuscript provides a comprehensive and informative review of the ANDE 6C Rapid DNA Analysis System. The structure is logical and well-organized, with each section addressing a key aspect of the technology's development and application.	

### **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>Stanley Udogadi Nwawuba</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Brazil</b>