



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Must pay attention to punctuation. • Inconsistency in spaces between words, before or after punctuation etc. Might be artefact of conversion to PDF • Statements in line 19 – 26 not referenced • The source of the ISSR and SRAP primers not mentioned. If primers sequences are taken from other research it need to be stated so. • SRAP technique should either be referenced or techniques should be described and then still referenced to acknowledge the developer. • Line 203. "Rapid" technique should be "RAPD"? • References are only numbered if the numbers is used in the text. • "Najaphy, et. al. 201" (line 149) is "Najafi,A.,Shafiei,H., Barazesh,A., Najafi,S., Mohammadian (line 412 - 416)..... in references • "Xin, and Junping C. 2012" (line 70) is "Xin, Z., j. Chen. 2012" in references • References must be in the same format, e.g. the initials for is first in "B.M. Prasanna" (line 409) but not in other	
<u>Minor</u> 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 Furthermore, RAPDS are a rather outdated marker due to the low repeatability between laboratories. • Will be beneficial if compare the dendrograms of the different markers with each other	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	WS Jansen van Rensburg
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Council—Vegetable and Ornamental Plant Institute, Pretoria, South Africa