

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_131082
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND IN SILICO VALIDATION OF PRIMERS FOR ASSESSING GENE EXPRESSION IN THE CANONICAL INFLAMMATORY PATHWAY
Type of the Article	Short communication

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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 work has a strong idea at its basic level. This work was composed as a rough draft. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.	I partially understand your points, but that is exactly why this work was submitted in the short communication format and if I did not submit this work after the publication of my other works, someone else could do it.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks for the review
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.	yes	Thanks for the review
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There is insufficient information in the article's introduction. The most important aspects (designed goals) are ignored in this work. You should insert of your schematics, diagrams, or charts because it is difficult to understand all of the complex procedures and specific results details.	I will not go into further detail because it is a short communication and not an original article, the magazine limits the number of figures to 3 and I needed to use all three with the results.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Definitions of all the key terminology and an extensive survey of the literature must be included in the introduction. Additionally, the methodology section requires additional details that should be organized according to how your job was planned. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details with recent references. The statistical analysis isn't supported up by major specific data. Which statistical program was used is unclear in the authors' description Throughout the results, and discussion sections, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated. There are different sections were not written clearly without grammatical or spelling errors. Kindly specify which statistics software version you are employing (in separate section). You should also consider using charts, figures, diagrams with standard deviation bars in your results. Clearly describing the diagram in the findings section is also a smart idea. You should also provide a more detailed description of your decision's targets, including the particular pathway that you planned to implement. Also, the discussion that took place was extremely disorganized and useless.	I understand the surveys, but in this case we did not use statistical analysis because the results of the in silico analysis are already the product of the simulated interactions in the context of the primer stability. So we did not perform analysis of variance or any associative measures that require statistics or linking Gaph Pad Prism or SPSS; the tools we used were provided by the American NCBI as mentioned in the methodology. I understand your concern about the methodological details, but this article, being a short communication on molecular biology/genetic engineering, ends up being something very specific and we cannot easily have a reading for the public that is not from the life sciences area... Mainly because in a short communication I cannot elaborate on the methodology. As for the discussion, your honor would be completely right if you were referring to a full article, however, as it is a Short Communication, we cannot extend the discussion because the focus is on the results and that is basically what we did... We are grateful for the review.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.	We made the correction, in fact the version of the article that was submitted had an error in the references, we adjusted them and increased them as requested.
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	