

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	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only based on '**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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article seems quite categorical in overall structure but less explanatory in data under sections or sub-sections.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title seems a little broad to me, I would suggest narrowing down the vagueness of the word 'molecular biology' with 'transcriptomics'</p> <p>'RNA-Sequencing: Revolutionizing Transcriptomics in the era of '</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Seems fine but no need to add time and place of study as this is common for review articles.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, but terminologies need to be capitalized and font sizes need to be justified concerning section/subsection.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is a little vague to me and also I wish I could see the visuals and tables in this article.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are fine.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would recommend adding the information that is too little in paragraph as tabulation form. Explain each section in more detail before going into sub-sections.</p> <p>I recommend adding a graphical abstract to this article.</p> <p>I like Table 1, following that and adding more to give a quick overview for each section. Make tables for each section or add some visuals as well with the application section.</p>	

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:	Bakar Bin Khatab Abbasi
Department, University & Country	Northeastern University, USA