



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14641
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC VARIABILITY CHARACTERIZATION OF ALUPE NAPIER GRASS ACCESSIONS BASED ON SIMPLE SEQUENCE REPEAT MARKERS
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1/I suggest the modification of all key words by the following ones: Genetic diversity, Genetic relationships, <i>Pennisetum pupureum</i>, Population structure- Simple sequence repeats transferability. 2/Authors should indicate in the introduction the regime of reproduction and ploidy level of the studied species. 3/In material and methods, origin and symbol of different populations must be given in a table. 4/ In the text, the references must be cited in the end of the sentences. 5/ Line 86 "to 0.96 (CTM59)" must be replaced by "0.98 (PGIRD25)" 6/I don't see that table 4 is relevant as the mean and the highest distance values are mentioned in the text. Only the distance average should be added. Instead of writing (table 4) in line 105, (Data not shown) is recommended.	The following changes have been effected; Changes has been made on the key words; The ploidy levels of the material understudy has not been established, however, the ploidy levels of Napier grass and its hybrids is indicated; Referencing has been effected in accordance with the author's guideline; Changes on line 86 have been effected; Table 4 has not been deleted because it still has information on genetic distance of other clones that might be of interest to the readership
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors should review the form of the tables. They should be identical. (invisible lines, alignments, interlines...).	Table format has been harmonised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		