

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_112377
Title of the Manuscript:	Legal and Ethical Considerations in the Use of DNA Fingerprinting
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The theme is inherently intriguing as it addresses crucial questions at the intersection of technology, ethics, and individual rights, while contemplating international implications in the realms of criminal justice and forensic medicine.</p> <p>2- Navigating Legal and Ethical Complexities of DNA Fingerprinting in Criminal Justice</p> <p>3- The sentence addresses multiple topics (privacy concerns, informed consent, accuracy and reliability of DNA evidence, etc.), but the transition between these ideas could be clearer to facilitate understanding. Some sections of the sentence are lengthy and intricate, potentially impeding comprehension. It could benefit from simplification for a smoother reading experience. We observed the absence of keywords.</p> <p>4- The manuscript generally has a well-organized structure with subsections that cover various aspects of legal and ethical considerations in the use of DNA fingerprinting. However, there are a few points to consider The conclusion is comprehensive but slightly lengthy. Consider summarizing key points concisely and reiterating the main message without repeating too much of what has been previously discussed. Adding specific examples, case studies, or references to support arguments can strengthen the manuscript's credibility and provide practical context to the discussed concepts. Overall, the structure is appropriate, and the suggested adjustments aim to enhance clarity, engagement, and the overall impact of the manuscript.</p> <p>5- The ideas are not linked to their source; they are not referenced.</p> <p>6- The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality of the article appears suitable for scholarly communications. The sentences are well-structured, and the vocabulary used is appropriate for academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Keywords: You have mentioned "Keywords:" at the end of your abstract, but the list of keywords is empty. Make sure to provide relevant keywords to enhance the searchability and visibility of your article.</p> <p>2- Examples and Case Studies: To bolster the credibility of your argumentation, consider adding concrete examples, case studies, or specific references to support your points. This will further ground your discussion in practical reality.</p> <p>3- Continued Dialogue: You emphasize the importance of ongoing dialogue among scientists, legal experts, ethicists, and the public. You might consider including specific suggestions on how to foster this dialogue, perhaps through conferences, forums, or other platforms.</p> <p>4- Missing References: In some parts, you mention general ideas without referencing specific sources. Adding references will enhance the credibility of these statements.</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:	Houinsou Bokpe Joanie
Department, University & Country	Université d'Abomey, Bénin