

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118581
Title of the Manuscript:	DNA Barcoding: Accelerating insect species discovery and biodiversity documentation
Type of the Article	Minireview 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, this manuscript is highly important for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of entomology, taxonomy, biodiversity conservation. 1. It provides a comprehensive overview of DNA barcoding, a revolutionary technique that has transformed insect identification and taxonomy. 2. The manuscript highlights the advantages of DNA barcoding over traditional morphological identification methods. 3. It discusses the current status of insect DNA barcoding in India, emphasizing the vast opportunity for further research and documentation of the country's rich insect diversity. 4. The manuscript explores the limitations, drawbacks and advancements in DNA barcoding.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, the abstract provided is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key points covered in the review article.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Follow the format as per the author guidelines of the journal	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript does not address the potential issue of nuclear mitochondrial DNA segments (NUMTs) co-amplifying with the COI barcoding region, which can lead to inaccurate species identification. A section discussing the implications of NUMTs and strategies to mitigate their impact, such as the use of specific primer sets or bioinformatic filters, could be valuable. 2. While the manuscript covers DNA metabarcoding, it could further explore the potential of mitochondrial metagenomics, which involves sequencing and analyzing the complete mitochondrial genomes from environmental samples. This approach could provide additional resolution and insights into species diversity and community composition.	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor changes required - Grammer changes - Paraphrasing	
Optional/General comments	Try to include the latest and numerous references wherever required.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marri Keerthana
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University (RPCAU), India