

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>For the purposes of systematics and the discernment of enigmas in relation to closely related species, the work is very useful. It establishes differences to take into account for the identification of species, which sometimes becomes difficult only having morphological references.</p> <p>Title is appropriate.</p> <p>Although genetic terms are very technical, those related to this field will find it very understandable.</p> <p>The structure is appropriate, although there are formal details, such as in the Summary that must be corrected.</p> <p>The work is complex and required a lot of research with equally complex methods. In my opinion it is correct.</p> <p>The management of the bibliography is the Achilles heel of this work. The author should review the rules for the use of the bibliography. Comments by the reviewer in the text show the errors that must be corrected.</p> <p>Correct what was indicated in the comments of the text. Example such as the omission of bibliographies in the text and exceeding the number of citations by arguments in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>In our opinion, English is well managed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work can be published, as long as the indications are rectified.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Luis Remedios Hernández</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cuba</b>