**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **American Journal of Experimental Agriculture** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJEA_20371** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Estimation the Degree of Diversity for Some Iraqi Wheat Varieties through ISSR, SRAP and RAPID Markers** |
| Type of the 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)

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 | • Must pay attention to punctuation.<br>• Inconsistency in spaces between words, before or after punctuation etc. Might be artefact of conversion to PDF<br>• Statements in line 19 – 26 not referenced<br>• The source of theISSR and SRAP primers nor mentioned. If primers sequences are taken from other research it need to be stated so.<br>• SRAP technique should either be referenced or techniques should be described and then still referenced to acknowledge the developer.<br>• Line 203. "Rapid" technique should be "RAPD"?<br>• References are only numbered if the numbers is used in the text.<br>• "Najaphy, et. al. 201" (line 149) is "Najafi,A.,Shafiei,H., Barazesh,A., Najafi,S., Mohammadian (line 412 - 416)….. in references<br>• "Xin, and Junping C. 2012" (line 70) is "Xin, Z., j. Chen. 2012" in references<br>• References must be in the same format, e.g. the initials for is first in "B.M. Prasanna" (line 409) but not in other | All these points have been reviewed and rewritten. |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | • Table 4: The RAPD primers are commercial available. Is it necessary to give their sequences? Furthermore, RAPDS are a rather outdated marker due to the low repeatability between laboratories.<br>• Will be beneficial if compare the dendrograms of the | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | different markers with each other | |
| **Optional/General** comments | • Results well presented<br>• Introduction will benefit with some language revision<br>• Tables are big and cumbersome and not in the format that is normally used in scientific publications | |