



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9843
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF AFLP MARKERS FOR SCREENING RESISTANCE TO COMMON BEAN ROOT ROT (Pythium spp.)
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	This is a professionally written manuscript, however, there is a legion of misprints that should be corrected before publication. The theme meets the scope of the journal. ABSTRACT Row 9 – seed stockiest as well as 10 breeders Row 15 – KARI kakamega Row 17 – Segregation revealed two major groups, with resistant varieties AND1062, R2075, R719, R1946 and SCAM80 being more genetically related to market class of beans. Cluster analysis revealed that resistant bean varieties were genetically different from the susceptible bean varieties. Row 21 – AFLP marker is an informative, reliable technique for delineating susceptible and resistant <i>Pythium</i> root rot dry bean varieties. INTRODUCTION Row 20 – angular leaf spot, anthracnose halo blight bean common mosaic virus Row 25 – <i>Fusarium solani</i> f. sp. phaseoli Row 31 – susceptible to this fungus Row 32 – adapted and marketable acceptable Row 34 – conventional breeding techniques of selection characterized Row 35 – resistant bean lines Row 35 – farmers' acceptability of the acceptable suitable varieties	Corrected corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Row 36 – to develop ~~acceptable~~ suitable <i>Pythium</i> Row 38 – phenotypes and enhance	Corrected
	MATERIALS AND METHODS Row 60 – 4 µl etc. ~~REVISE~~ and correct his mistake up to 93!!!!!! Row 64 – MseI/Tru 91 adaptors Row 66 – ligation component. The 10 µl was pipetted Row 67 – incubated for 3 hours Row 35 – preamplification Row 75 – diluted preamplification PCR product Row 78 – Bioline Biomix™ containing Row 85 – deionized formamide Row 106 – ?????? Row 114 – unweighted pair group Row 123 – For authenticity, four bean populations were selected [Eastern (Embu and Meru), Eastern (Mbeere and Machakos), Western and Market centers] for comparative analysis and screened using a SCAR marker (PYAA 19800) developed from previous studies in Colombia (Mahuku, 2007). DISCUSSION Row 137 – A The large number of percentages Row 139 – KARI Kakamega Row 140 – in importance in the recent years recently in East and Row 142 – Transfer this paragraph (rows 142-147) to the chapter Materials and Methods (row 48)! Row 153 – but they are were not of preferred market classes Row 162 – <i>Pythium</i> root rot resistance is controlled by a single dominant gene [21]. His These experiments involved - Hard to believe! The tolerance of plants to various soil borne fungal pathogens has common sites. One can opine a single dominant gene, but this can not guarantee the long lasting field resistance as a	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Made clear Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Row 142- Explained in a clearer way. It belongs in the discussion because it is somebody else's work. We have made the point clearer with some corrections to the best knowledge of the authors of this study



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>pathogen can combat it with a point mutation. We may assume several genetically coded factors of resistance (3-9 or more) common to various plant species and also some particular characters. I suggest to think about.</i> CONCLUSION Row 198 – by resource poor small holder Row 204 – the consumer's preferences, acceptable???? REFERENCES THE REFERENCES NEITHER ARE EDITED ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORS GUIDE OF THE JOURNAL NOR ARE UNIFORM! THESE SHOULD BE SCRUPULOUSLY REVISED AND CORRECTED!	Corrected Corrected Corrected according to the authors guide.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		