

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

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.	The research idea is good. Also the researchers have done vast work. Modification for DNA isolation seems good. But, authenticating primers should be designed very carefully.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Good	
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.	Ok	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Ok	
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.	Research idea and scope is good. But main backbone of this work is use of authenticating primers for confirmation of the species. Out of three pairs of authenticating primers designed in this study, BLAST search results shows that two pairs viz. ITSTCC1F/R and ITSPEC1F/R are not species specific. ITSTBCF seems relatively more species specific, but BLAST search result shows <i>Terminalia chebula</i> , <i>T. arjuna</i> , <i>T. Amazonia</i> , <i>T. calamansanay</i> etc. also have query cover and percentage identity both value 100 %. In such circumstances, it is not possible to authenticate the species based on successful amplification and amplicon size.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ok	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madhu Shudan Thapa Magar
Department, University & Country	Nepal