

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_128366
Title of the Manuscript:	Producing Collection Kit for SARS-COV-2 from Urine and Stool for Extracting its RNA
Type of the Article	Original

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a significant advancement in the field of viral diagnostics by introducing a novel collection kit specifically designed for the extraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from urine and stool samples. The demonstrated efficacy of the kit in isolating the virus with high success rates from alternative biological fluids, as well as the superior RNA.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article could be considered somewhat informative, but it may benefit from being more concise and specific. A more suitable title could be: "Development of a Collection Kit for Efficient Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Urine and Stool Samples" This title clearly communicates the purpose of the study, emphasizes the development of the kit, and specifies the biological samples involved.	

Review Form 3

<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>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, but there are several areas where it could be enhanced for clarity and impact. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Background Information: Consider adding a brief sentence about the significance of detecting SARS-CoV-2 in urine and stool samples. For example, mention how these samples can serve as alternative sources for diagnosis, potentially leading to better patient outcomes.</p> <p>Objective Statement: Explicitly state the main objective of the study at the beginning of the abstract. For example, "This study aimed to develop a collection kit for the effective extraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from urine and stool samples."</p> <p>Methodology: While the abstract mentions the components of the kit and its effectiveness, it may benefit from a brief description of the methodology used to evaluate the kit's performance. For instance, mention that the performance was assessed through RT-PCR testing.</p> <p>Results: Provide more specific statistical data on the effectiveness of the kit. For instance, instead of just stating the percentages of success in isolating RNA, include sample sizes or any relevant statistical significance (if applicable). Briefly mention any comparative findings on RNA concentration between different sample types (urine, stool, and nasopharyngeal swabs) and their implications.</p> <p>Conclusion and Implications: Summarize the implications of the findings by briefly stating how this kit could influence future diagnostic practices or public health responses to COVID-19. Consider adding a sentence about the potential for this method to enhance surveillance or understanding of viral shedding in COVID-19 patients.</p> <p>Keywords: Ensure that the keywords are representative of the core themes of the study and consider including terms like "diagnostic kit," "RNA preservation," or "viral detection."</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Based on the provided manuscript titled "Producing Collection Kit for SARS-CoV-2 from Urine and Stool for Extracting its RNA," here are some scientific observations regarding its correctness:</p> <p>Lack of Controls: The manuscript does not mention whether appropriate controls were utilized in the study to validate the effectiveness of the kit. Including positive and negative controls is crucial for ensuring the robustness of the results.</p> <p>Sample Size: The study mentions that stool samples were taken from 20 individuals. While this provides preliminary data, a larger sample size would strengthen the conclusions and improve the statistical power of the findings.</p> <p>Comparison with Existing Methods: The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed comparison with existing methods for RNA extraction from other sample types. This would help contextualize the advantages or limitations of the new kit.</p> <p>Cycle Threshold (Ct) Value Interpretation: The interpretation of Ct values in the context of RNA concentration needs clarification. It would be beneficial to explain how the values correlate with viral load and the implications for diagnosis.</p> <p>Potential Limitations: The study should address any potential limitations or biases, such as patient demographics, timing of sample collection in relation to symptom onset, and variations in viral shedding among individuals.</p> <p>Conclusion Overall, the manuscript presents a scientifically interesting and potentially valuable contribution to the field of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics through the development of a new collection kit. However, it would benefit from improvements in methodology, larger sample sizes, and a clearer contextualization of results. Addressing these points would enhance the scientific rigor and validity of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>-</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:	Adele Rafati
Department, University & Country	Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Iran