

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_101511
Title of the Manuscript:	DNA barcodes for estimation of species phylogeny in some Rails (Gruiformes: Rallidae)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study is important for the scientific community because it studied the phylogenetic relationship of some species of Rallidae, a family of birds whose phylogenetic relationships of many genera have not yet been investigated. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent, but it is necessary to review their formatting. <p>In Material and Methods, the authors must make it clear how many individuals were collected and how many specimens of each species were used in the study. In the paragraph below Figure 2, authors need to delete a sentence that seems to have been forgotten to be removed. Authors should review the scientific names, as some of them are not written in italics.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Katia Alcione Kopp
Department, University & Country	School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Brasil