

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 Research

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This technique is very basic scientific tools which act as promising isolation and storage method of the virus. Now a days the COVID19 virus research arena is a challengeable job modern scientific way. This article provide very low cost as well as user friendly way to detect virus from human excreta which is easy to collect than that sputum, saliva or other pharyngeal parts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not very suitable for all types of readers. The title is more technical, which is not very attractive to the scientific community. A alternative title is "A novel scientific collection kit development of SARS-COV-2 from human excreta"	
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.	Not very comprehensive, Abstract always being not very elaborate. In my opinion the abstract will rewritten by deleting the methods related points (indicated in reviewers comment)	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No need for additional reference but the reference given was not in proper order. Please mention all of the references in a particular style.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable for scholarly communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article will be thoroughly checked by authors, either any reference can be missed or not. Checked for typing error (which I found in article) Add some of the future scopes and advancing the technologies which further can be adopted by scientific authorities for further research in end portion of conclusion part. <p>The phrase is "Isolation" (line no.6) The scientific name of the buffer is always phosphate buffer saline or PBS (line no. 9) Keywords must be edited (mentioned in the comment in the attached manuscript) (line no. 16) Writing pattern should be like this (mentioned in the attached manuscript) (line no. 19) Typing error (line no. 54-55) Scientific phrase can be added (added in attached manuscript) (line no. 63) Typing error (line no. 69) The chemical name mentioned is not in proper style (mentioned in the comment in the attached manuscript) (line no. 74) Typing error (line no. 85) Be more specific (line no. 89) Highlighted portion mentioned earlier in materials and methods also. If it is necessary to mention, please write only the function of the chemicals. (line no. 116 – 119)</p> <p>Please mention the quality of RNA (the concentration of RNA, A260/A280 ratio) in the article or as supplementary in table form (it is also functioning index for the quality of the kit)</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:	Shibasis Mukherjee
Department, University & Country	Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, India