

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_119734</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Molecular identification of Indian Peafowl <i>Pavo cristatus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (Aves: Phasianidae) through DNA Barcoding using feather calamus</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>It is important, since it provides scientific and technical resources for identification, through analysis of DNA codes, of body parts of threatened and/or endangered species.</p> <p>According to the rule of writing scientific works, acronyms should not be used in the title. In this case DNA is an acronym, but listing the name would be very extensive. Although there could be a variant of the title such as: Identification of Indian Peafowl <i>Pavo cristatus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (Aves: Phasianidae) using feather calamus by molecular genetic method.</p> <p>This right.</p> <p>The author must review the structure in relation to section 3 of Results and discussed and in section 4. See revised work.</p> <p>It is explicit and clear.</p> <p>Only the recommendations made in the Summary and in the first paragraphs of the Introduction. See the review of the work.</p> <p>The work is interesting and well written. Just confirm what we have pointed out here.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language is well used.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work can be published saving the indicated details.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

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