

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123318
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing the Yield of Therapeutic Plasmids in Laboratory-Scale Maxiprep Preparations through a Modified Alkaline Lysis Approach
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	this will help the researchers to obtain the plasmids in bulk for their study in the future. If the method got successfully implemented and as claimed increase the yield of bacterial biomass definitely leads to solve a lot of problems during the cross contaminations of plasmids.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Its fine but I will suggest modifying the title to more specific.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It's well written and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it's appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The researchers have done very nice work and the manuscript is well written. Still i want to suggest a few corrections and also i have a few questions to rectify, Firstly, mention the source, ref. No. And the make for DH5 alpha cells undertaken for study. Are there any significant changes observed by the authors in the cells during modified culturing as compared to traditional/recent methods? Does the purified plasmid yield changes significant as per the study? Any change in the morphological characters of the bacterial cells like colony morphology and growth pattern excluding yield/ turbidity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I think there is a need to add 4-5 more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it's appropriate and suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	None	

Review Form 3

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:	Neha Chauhan
Department, University & Country	University of Kota, India