

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_102538
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Diversity of Fifty Coffee Genotypes using Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR) 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:

(<https://www.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript could be important for the scientific community after major corrections are done to improve on the quality of work. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p> <p>Yes, but could be modified as <b>Genetic Diversity of Coffee Genotypes using Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR) Markers.</b></p> <p>The abstract needs improvement as suggested in the annotated manuscript.</p> <p>No. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for appropriate action in the materials and methods.</p> <p>This aspect can be improved. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p> <p>The references are sufficient, but might be improved. The authors should consistently follow the journal style of referencing in both in text and cataloguing in the reference section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The grammatical errors need to be fixed throughout the document.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

	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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Prince Emmanuel Norman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sierra Leone Agricultural Research Institute, Sierra Leone</b>