



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_64820
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic identification: A Review On Autosomal Short Nucleotide Polymorphism's as diagnostic Tool for Identifying Human.
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a review manuscript which should analyze the primary research results already conducted on the present topic and summarize the current status. However, this pattern is not followed in many sections of the manuscript and therefore, the same may be carefully revised citing the references. 2. The author mentions that "Studies that were not performed in English language or performed before 2010 were not included in the review". However a number of references are included in the review before 2010. For example, Sudwala and van Daal, 2008. A number of such pre-2010 references are included in the manuscript which needs careful removal and inclusion of new references post-2010. The text needs to be revised accordingly. 3. A number of statement is made without citing any reference. For example, "Age of an individual can also be predicted through DNA testing. The shrinkage of telomeres and the deletion of mitochondrial DNA related with the process of ageing have found applicability in forensics for the prediction of age of an individual. However, there are certain limitations in their value of practicality." This is an important analysis/statement made, however, no reference is cited. Therefore, citation of proper reference for such statement is mandatory. 4. In many places, sentence construction of the manuscript is poor and not understandable. For example, "Some time if the biological sample is difficult to be analyzed due to in adequate sample (van Oorschot et al, 2010)". Here, the sentence ends abruptly without any complete meaning. This type of sentence incompleteness occurred many times in the manuscript. This needs overall English language checking and through revision. 5. Factual incorrectness: For example, the authors have mentioned in the "Prediction of Hair Color" section, "In the investigation of 46 SNPs which were obtained from 13 genes has observed an accuracy of 0.87, 0.93, 0.81, and 0.82 for the prediction of black, red, blond, and brown hairs respectively..... (Branicki et al, 2011)". However, the original paper discussed about 45 SNPs from 12 genes associated with red hair color in Polish population. This type of factual incorrectness is fatal and therefore, needs to be checked and corrected thoroughly in the manuscript for other references. 6. A number of references are either missing in the text or missing in the Reference section. For example, Pongracz, 2013 reference was found in the text, but missing in the reference section. This type of carelessness was found throughout the manuscript and needs careful overall check and corrections. 7. Few important references, particularly recent post-2010 references are missing from the manuscript. For example, Houssein Khodjet-el-khil et al (2011): Genetic analysis of the SNPforID 34-plex ancestry informative SNP panel in Tunisian and Libyan populations 8. Meanings of many sentences are either not clear or incomplete. Therefore, the English language of the text needs through revision. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different fonts are used in the manuscript throughout (Times New Roman, Mangal etc.). Since I believe only one standard font should be used for the text, this also needs to be revised and only one standard font may be used in the manuscript. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript entitled "Genetic identification : A Review On Autosomal Short Nucleotide Polymorphism's as diagnostic Tool for Identifying Human" discussed about the use of various autosomal SNPs for forensic use. The topic chosen is new, while the originality and focus of the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>review is relevant for a decent publication. However, the language of the manuscript is not up-to the mark and a lot of things including the Introduction, Result, Discussion and Conclusion parts need to be revised carefully. The manuscript requires overall major revisions as mentioned in the Major and Minor REVISION comments sections as well as on the body of the manuscript in the comments panel. The manuscript may be published after incorporating the major revisions.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sabyasachi Mukherjee
Department, University & Country	ICAR-National Dairy Research Institute, India