

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124006
Title of the Manuscript:	RNA Sequencing: A New Frontier in Molecular Biology
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript clearly tries to spotlight the importance of RNA sequencing in molecular biology. As RNA sequencing is one of the main innovations which aids to decode the blueprint of human life, DNA; this manuscript and its content is really helpful to understand the process. At the same time, I would like suggest if the writing was written in more continuous pattern, it would have been easier to understand for the readers. And I noticed, reference sources were taken from the articles published more than 10 years ago. As per general rule, for a research paper, we should consider reference articles from past 5-10 years.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title showcased the importance of RNA sequencing. But RNA sequencing was in use in the field of molecular biology from 1972; later on many new innovations were introduced in the field. So Instead of addressing as New frontier, some other words like cornerstone would have been more appropriate. Suggestion - RNA Sequencing: A Cornerstone in modern Molecular Biology	
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.	Various RNA sequencing technologies are explained very well along with advantages and disadvantages as well. I would suggest adding more figures and tables. And explanation of figure and table should be given in the respective section. Add more detailed explanation and make sure to avoid repetition.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Could have been better. I loved how it started and later continuity was missing. Methodologies and methods are quite confusing.	
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.	Avoid repetitions. Few add on were unnecessary. Title with few words of definition might not comprehend the whole story to the readers. If adding any topic, its better to keep all connected so that it will be helpful for further references to the readers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, but a lot them are taken from articles published 10 years ago. References should be taken from the articles of maximum 5-10 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is okay, but could have added some fluency.	
Optional/General comments	Add more figures and tables. I will make the paper more interesting. Rework on the references used. Delete the unnecessary information and try to make a continuity and fluency.	

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:	Anaswara Kuzhipurayidathil Vijayakumar
Department, University & Country	USMF, Moldova