SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_AJEA_6337**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Genetic and Mineral Diversity Among three Solanum Species using EST-SSR and AAS**
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	The methodologies is largely inadequate for considering the manuscript to be published in a quality controlled, peer-reviewed, open access journal like American Journal of Experimental Agriculture (AJEA). Indeed, the origin of EST-SSR utilized is reported neither in the table nor in the cited literature. The title and the aim of the paper is not clear as well, because the Authors utilized together molecular markers (EST-SSR) and the mineral concentration by using AAS. How are useful these last traits to evaluate the genetic diversity? Anyway, why the Authors do not consider to evaluate the genetic distances by using together the data set ?	Other suggested comments accepted and correction effected. However, authors do not agree that methodologies are no adequate as evidence by the other reviewers. This is because the other reviewers did not comment about its inadequacy but rather approved of it and made input especially the third reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	Plant material is of interest for that area of cultivation but there are not included in the study any tester or international cultivar useful to compare the genetic diversity of this limited collection and the international collection of eggplant and allied species. No news important information come out from the reported results on the genetic distances among different species related to eggplant (e.g. see Isshiki et al 2003 Genetic Resource and crop evolution 50: 133-137).	Comment accepted and correction effected.
Optional/General comments	The English is very poor in all part of the manuscript. The Introduction is not well organized and nothing is reported on EST-SSR and other classes of MM already developed in eggplant. In addition, no information are mentioned related to AAS and other techniques in order to analyse mineral plant concentration and how this aspect is important for selecting genotypes in Africa.	Authors acknowledge some few grammatical errors and the unitalised 'genus' (*Solanum*) of scientific names used as indicated by the other reviewers. However authors do not agree that the English expressions were poor in all part of the manuscript.

	If the Authors should like to reconsider for a new submission, they are requested to change several part of the manuscript taking in mind the new technologies for analysing SSR in plant collection. In addition, the data analysis have to be performed with clear and identified methods and softwares. The figures suffer for their insufficient definition and the inadequate graphic presentation.	