



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10284
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC DIVERSITY OF DRY BEAN (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) ACCESSIONS OF KENYA USING SSR 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	Major flaw of this manuscript is lack of explanation for the grouping of accessions into four populations. Accessions are listed in Table 1. but there is no indication of their affiliation to four populations (lines 60-61). The reason for using simple matching coefficient or explanation of data scoring should be given (line 86). Reasons for assuming Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium should be explained (lines 86-91). Lines 155-163 supported by Figure 2. and Table 4. just contribute even further to the aforementioned confusion. Besides the four populations, the accessions can also be grouped in a different way, according to variety (type?). This grouping can probably be traced back to Table 1., but why is it not mentioned at all in Materials and Methods? What was the reason for using two different groupings? It should all be clearly and thoroughly explained in Materials and Methods. Furthermore, Table 4. reveals small and uneven populations sizes, raising the question of appropriateness of the used methods (indices). Figures 3. and 4. bear no indication of either of the groupings, thus becoming completely useless for the uninformed reader. Discussion has some weak points as well, but it is pointless to give any comments before the improvement of both Materials and Methods and Results.	A column has been created in table 1 and information on population affiliation inserted to depict the affiliations of the accessions to the four populations An elaborate data analysis section has been inserted in the methods. As such, there is sufficient reason(s) provided for the choice of data analysis methods (Hardy-Weinberg/simple matching coefficient) used. Data scoring has also been strengthened in methods section Germplasm collection sites are embedded within the section of materials and methods. The varietal information has been removed from the whole document to discontinue creating confusion The original table 4 has been deleted from the results section. Discussion has been improved
Minor REVISION comments	References 9 and 12 seem to be identical?	The right ref 12 has been inserted
Optional/General comments		