



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	<i>The article presents information on genetic conservation of some species. Studies on genetic variability and genetic information access are of great importance for the implementation of production through genetic improvement. Thus, studies using molecular biology are extremely important for the advancement of technology and science.</i> <i>I make some comments to authors. Please revise and check them.</i> <i>Also, please clear the query I have highlight in the manuscript regarding the results.</i> Detailed Comments: The article presents information on genetic conservation of some species. Studies on genetic variability and genetic information access are of great importance for the implementation of production through genetic improvement. Thus, studies using molecular biology are extremely important for the advancement of technology and science. I make some comments to authors. Please revise and check them. Also, please clear the query I have highlight in the manuscript regarding the results. Title The title is sensible. ABSTRACT The abstract is quite long. I propose new one. INTRODUCTION P1, Line 14: delete the comma: Dry bean (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) is a ...	Abstract has been shortened to 249 words. Note: The abstract is prepared in format provided by the Journal



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P1, Line 23-24: delete this sentence, "Dry beans are cultivated mostly by women for subsistence and the market on more than 5600 hectogram per hectare, accounting for a quarter of global output". P1: use the new one of FAOSTAT. P2 Line 32: I propose to replace these sentences (about SSR) after next paragraph. "Microsatellites P2, Line 35: 'co-dominant' instead of 'co- dominant' P2 Line 34-37: This is too ling. I propose to use some subject. "They are the best through out the genome". P2 Line 38-41: delete the sentence, 'Its' analysis ... banding patterns. P2 Line 42-44: delete the sentence, "There are several for SSR". P2 Line 51: 'In this study' instead of in this project' P2 Line 52: bring "EurofinsTM at the material section. MATERIAL AND METHODS I propose to choose these titles for materials and methods section: Plant materials, DNA extraction, PCR amplification, and Data analysis. Not Bean germplasm and Data scoring and cluster analysis. P5 Line 72: min ute correct with minute. P5 Line 80: ex tension correct with extension.	Done as proposed Done as proposed FAOSTAT 2012 used Done as proposed Done This part was deleted Done as proposed Done as proposed Done as proposed Done as proposed Done as proposed - Is as stated - Is as stated
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P5 Line 86: Also, please write" how did you score the SSR gels? I mean, the alleles were scored as present (1) or absent (0)? Clear this. RESULTS P 5 Line 99: among the ... Also correct this in the Table 5 and Fig 3. P 6 Table 6: Did you use SSR markers or ISSR? SSR primers or SSR primer pairs? SSR have a Forward & Reverse? Please clear this. P 7: draw the Table 4, according to the Table 2' structure. REFERENCES Please check the references again. I have some comments like: No 3: use new one. No 6: delete (1996) No 15: delete (1999) No 22: correct 106, 239 – 250. No 29: check 2005;pp122-128. No 36: replace the 2005 at the end. No 37: check Crop Sci.2002;42:2128-2136.	A sentence has been inserted to clear this. Ref line 81-83 Done as proposed SSR primer pairs were used to amplify the segments. However only SSR forward primer sequences (5'-3') are indicated as stated on table 2 Done FAOSTAT 2012 used Done Done Corrected Corrected Done Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		