



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9235
Title of the Manuscript:	SSR-DNA Polymorphism in some Egyptian Wheat
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 (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	TITLE: <i>Change to - SSR-DNA Polymorphism in some Egyptian Wheat varieties</i> ABSTRACT: - <i>Reedit and eliminate the redundant sentences!</i> <i>For example:</i> DNA polymorphism of three Egyptian wheat varieties was analysed aiming to develop molecular markers associated with some different traits in wheat using simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers and usefulness of these markers to detect possible specific markers to be utilized in the wheat future breeding programs in Egypt. Among 312 SSR markers selected from previous reports and USDA, Hard Winter Wheat Genetics Research Unit (Kansas State University, Manhattan KS, USA) for use in the current study 162 proved to be polymorphic. Results of these experiments consider the first step in the effective detection of polymorphism among some Egyptian wheat varieties in order to correct choose for parents in future INTRODUCTION: Row 39 - production. Different reviews <i>change to</i>	-Okay, noted for title -You are correct now abstract is more clear 312 Microsatellite markers used to analyze DNA polymorphism of three Egyptian wheat (Egypt 1, Gemmeiza 9 and Sakha 93) aiming to develop molecular markers associated using the simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers and usefulness of these markers to detect possible specific markers to be utilized in the wheat future breeding programs in Egypt. DNA was extracted using the CTAB method and PCR products were separated in an ABI 3730 DNA analyzer. Data were scored using GeneMarker and 2.5% Agarose gel. Total 477 fragments were detected, among 312 simple sequences repeat markers 162 proved to be polymorphic. The percentage of genetic polymorphism ranged from 33% up to 100 %. Fragment molecular weight ranged from 112 to 535 bp. Results of these experiments consider the first step in the effective detection of polymorphism among some Egyptian wheat varieties in order to correct choose for parents in future.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	production. Several reviews Row 43 - The present research will be a useful reference and initial step for conventional plant breeders, physiologists, pathologists and other plant scientists in Egypt whom work in wheat breeding for decrease the cost and time on select the markers in the future studies. <i>Move this sentence to the end of the paper and replace it here with the sentence of Abstract</i> - This study aimed to develop molecular markers associated with some different traits in wheat using simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers and usefulness of these markers to detect possible specific markers to be utilized in the wheat future breeding programs in Egypt. MATERIALS AND METHODS Row 58 - of 10× NH₄ PCR buffer <i>change to</i> of 10 × NH₄ PCR buffer Row 58 - 2.50 mM MgCl₂ <i>change to</i> 2.50 mM MgCl₂ Row 58 - 200 IM of each <i>What is the mean?</i> Rows 62-67 <i>_C change to °C</i> RESULTS AND DISCUSSION – The edition is muddy. Very difficult to understand! It is suggested to unite these two chapters. Moreover, overcome the redundancies in the text.	-Different change to several -All your comments are correct and helpful -Materials and Methods
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The aim is important, and the experiments have been described in detail. The technical work was seemingly well done. However, the composition is poor, and difficult to understand. The paper has to be reedited before publication.	