



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_34582
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of morphological variability in five spontaneous Populations of Rubus ulmifolius Schott in Tunisia
Type of the Article	Original 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment: <i>I agreed with reviewer comments, corrected the manuscript and highlighted that part in the manuscript and I wrote my feedback here.</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Italicize scientific names. 2. In some situations, the reference within the text has to be the name, followed by the reference number. Ex.: "Patamsyste et al. [5] intended to" (Pag. 2) 3. DNA phenotyping (Pg. 2). You mean DNA genotyping? 4. The asterisk is misused in Table 3. Please correct it. Non-significant comparisons should be determined by "ns" and not by an asterisk. 5. Figure 2 do not separate populations as proposed by Authors. There is an admixture of populations in the central region of the figure. It has to be better described and discussed. 6. The first and second paragraphs of the Discussion only repeat results. Can be excluded. 7. "The objective of this study was to evaluate the morphological diversity within and among natural populations..." Although the objective refers to within population diversity, no result or discussion about this topic is presented. 8. Authors conclude that "adaptive morphological changes observed in these populations reveal probably the progress of evolutionary phenomena within <i>Rubus ulmifolius</i> Schott.". Since the sampled material belongs from "five wild populations grown under different climatic conditions", an analysis of the relationship among morphological traits and climatic conditions may greatly contribute to understand/determine the putative origin of such possible evolutionary phenomena (temperature, rainfall, altitude, etc.).	1. I have Italicize all scientific names like species in the manuscript. 2. I have changed the reference [5] in page 2 of the manuscript with "Patamsyste et al. [5]". 3. I have changed "DNA phenotyping" (Pg. 2) with "DNA genotyping". 4. I have deleted all asterisks in Table 3 and replaced the non-significant comparisons by "ns" and the highly significant variations by "hs". 5. We noted that there is an admixture of populations in the central region of the figure (Fig. 2). Therefore, the populations studied of <i>R. ulmifolius</i> share some morphological characteristics between them. 6. I have deleted the first and second paragraphs of the Discussion. 7. I have deleted the term "within" in the aim of the abstract because we have only studied the morphological diversity among natural populations of <i>Rubus ulmifolius</i> Schott. 8. I added this sentence in conclusion: "an analysis of the relationship among morphological traits and climatic conditions may greatly contribute to understand the putative origin of possible evolutionary phenomena (temperature, rainfall, altitude, etc.)."
Optional/General comments		