



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/1579
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Application of SSR markers for genetic purity testing of some commercial hybrid maize (Zea mays L.) and their parental inbreds.</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Confused between SSR primers (nucleotides) vs. SSR markers. Title: markers, and line 5 and many other locations, primers.	Corrected. All SSR primers changed to SSR marker
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	Title: Revise. Genetic puritytesting --- delete testing, and their parental inbreds and hybrid maize - reverse the order. Abstract: analysisof – analysis of. Manuscript was not prepared carefull. Also in title – puritytesting should be purity testing. Line 6: Alongside – reword. Line 6: not primers but markers. Lines 7 – 9 reword. Just state that DAN was extracted . Line 8 – 11: split into two sentences. Careful reading is required: protocol.Alleles --- should have a space. Delete scoring in the abstract. Line 12: Again, not primers, but fragments – markers recorded as fragments. Line 15; genotypes.Results --- space. thatSSR primers – line 16: hybrids.Genetic --- Replace all SSR primers to SSR markers and/or fragments. The analysis is by fragment analysis as present (1) or abscent (0). Again, the abstract is too long and contained non-necessary information and poorly presented.	Title revised. Corrected as stated in the attached file The spaces between sentences that are missing were caused by the line number inserted to the manuscript, However it has been corrected. DNA extraction details deleted All SSR primers changed to SSR markers Abstract formatted and shortened.
Introduction	Split into two three paragraphs.. Too long. Add more references on SSR analysis in the introduction section. Shortened lines 23 – 36. Spacing: line 36, 41. This manuscript is not prepared well.	Corrected. References added. Line 66-70
Review of literature (Heading)		



SDI Review Form 1.5

may differ in the case of review paper)		
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Also split into several phrases. Lines 63--- not clear. Methods are too long and verbal. Just mention about the modification, not the entire procedures. Number of replications? Not clearly stated.	Line 63 deleted as part of DNA extraction details Molecular work are replicated by number of markers.
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Fig. 1 : change the font size. Fig. 2. No reaction for sample No. 7, middle lane.	Corrected.
Conclusion	Line 141 – 143 : Delete. Present the best primer pairs for SSR analysis.	Deleted.
References	Not checked during this review.	