

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126203
Title of the Manuscript:	DNA Barcoding assisted authentication of polyherbal formulation – Triphala
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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)
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.	This article put forward a new approach to evaluate herbal formulation hence useful for scientific community to carry out farther research work in this field. But major limitation of such methods is that they are not feasible to small scale manufacturers in terms of time and money.	Thank you for your valuable feedback.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable	Thank you for your positive feedback.
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.	Yes it is comprehensive	Thank you for your positive feedback.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Thank you for your positive feedback.
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.	Conclusion part need correction: 1. Without any comparison between two methods or parameters it can not be concluded that the current morphological and biochemical evaluation of herbal formulations may not be enough for the standardization of polyherbal formulations. 2. DNA barcoding can not be treated as standalone technique if traditional standardization approaches such as morphological, macroscopic, biochemical are carried out essentially as per requirements of Pharmacopoeia. 3. Lines mentioned under subtitle 'Results' in Abstract are sufficient to treat as conclusion limited to this study. Generalized conclusion statements can not be made based on findings of this single study and without comparative data. 4. <i>Terminalia bellirica</i> , <i>Terminalia chebula</i> and <i>Phyllanthus emblica</i> , name of botanist is essential at the end of name of each species for example <i>Terminalia bellirica</i> (Gaertn.) Roxb, it ensure correct identity of the species. This shall be corrected at least in introductory section. Rest of the part of the article is scientifically acceptable and reasonably correct	The present study is the part of a research project where the standardization is carried out on the bases of morphological, biochemical parameters along with the molecular level standardization. The findings of morphological, biochemical and microscopic standardization are included in another manuscript which is under consideration for publication. The suggested correction is incorporated in the revised manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Refrence number 1, year 2014, recent figure would have been more relevant.	The correction is made in the revised manuscript. Thank you for your valuable suggestion.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	Thank you for the positive feedback.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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)	No