



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJAAR _45099
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of genetic diversity in improved and local accessions of okra (Abelmoschus esculentus and Abelmoschus callei) using RADP markers.
Type of the Article	Short Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	This Ms is worthy enough to publish in JEAI with minor corrections. - For any RAPD work, the sample size should be at least 20. But here only three samples have taken for each accession. Is it enough, the authors should clarify. - The highlighted regions should be modified in the body text. - All references should be re-check and modify based on the journals format.	- I am not aware that there is a minimum sample size for RAPD work. However, the major work was to comparatively study the local accessions of okra in the immediate environments of the place where the research was conducted. And this was done comparatively with improved varieties which could be referred to as standard(s) when compared with other biological research works - The highlighted regions have all been modified and highlighted in yellow. They include use of DNA in place of dna, Table in place of table, and Figure in place of figure. - The references have been re-checked and modified based on the journal's format to the best of my knowledge.
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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>