

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_126445
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking Nature’s Genetic Secret: The Power of DNA Barcoding to identify mislabeled fish species with reference to Upper Lake, Bhopal
Type of the Article	Review Article

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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>	The paper is well-structured, with a clear introduction outlining the significance of DNA barcoding in identifying mislabeled fish species.	We believe it effectively summarizes the main contributions of our work, and we appreciate your conformation of its clarity and relevance.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title of the article are not suitable, In the review article there is no evident for DNA barcode of fish. So change titles</b>	According to title, we have added the details regarding the DNA Barcode of fish as suggested.
<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 abstracts is adequate addressed. Include some Molecular identified Fish list from the lake	We are pleased to hear that the abstract adequately addresses the key points of the paper.
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes, Subsection and structure of the manuscript is Adequate</b>	We are glad to hear.
<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 paper presents a valuable contribution to the field of fish species identification through DNA barcoding. With some refinements, it has the potential to effectively inform both scientific and conservation communities about the critical issue of species mislabeling in Upper Lake, Bhopal.	We greatly appreciate your recognition. Yes, some refinements has been done as per your suggestion.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Reference is sufficient, But there is no current references.	We have added the current references and highlight it as per your suggestion
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes it suitable,	We appreciate your confirmation that it meets the standard
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Please provide some DNA barcode evidences and NCBI or BOLD accession number of fish, You provided only the diversity list of fish in lake.	Provided the requested information and highlight it as per the reviewer's comment.

Review Form 3

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No