

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_95604
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of RNA extraction protocol for rat skeletal muscle samples
Type of the Article	Method 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://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important for some researchers in its own field.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No, the references are not enough and too old. The authors should cite some recent publications, especially those in the latest 3-5 years.</p> <p>7. The citations should be in a uniform format.</p> <p>8. Figure 1 should have a title and the two caption lowercase letters (a and b) should be changed to uppercase letters.</p> <p>9. Note that there are some discrepancies in the data. For example, in the Abstract, "Analyzes of RNA concentration (167,7±75,8 ng/μL), RIN (8,008±0,03981) and rate 28S/18S (1,4833±0,0718) showed satisfactory results." This is confusing because the RNA concentration (167,7±75,8 ng/μL) is from the Kit but RIN (8,008±0,03981) is from <i>TRIzol+Kit</i>. The authors should carefully check the whole manuscript to make sure that the data in the figure/chart and text are exactly the same.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No</p>	

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)
<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:

Name:	Shiping Liu
Department, University & Country	Southwest University, China