

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105019</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Easy and Economic Protocols for High Quality Genomic DNA Extraction and Sex Determination in Papaya using SCAR markers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>1. <b>Yes, it is.</b> Markers such as W11, NAPF-2, and PKBT-4 were able to distinguish sex expression in previous reports (Deputy et al., 2002; Lemos et al., 2002 and Parasnis et al., 2000). On the other hand, in the author's study, these markers did not give the same results in male and female plants, indicating that they are not effective in discriminating sex expression in papaya, at least in varieties CO-7 and CO-8. These differences in marker expression may provide clues to the cause of the diversity in sex expression among varieties. If there is anything detail that can be inferred as the cause of this difference, it would be of more scientific importance to add to the discussion.</p> <p>2. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>5. <b>If the following three points are revised, the answer is Yes. The first is that a molecular marker will be added to B in Figure 2. Second, the molecular sizes of all molecular markers in Figure 2 and 3 should be clearly stated, and third, the band sizes of each marker should be clearly stated in the text.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The yellow text at the top of the electrophoresis photo in Figure 3 is not visible. Are these letters necessary?</p> <p>2. Arrows indicating amplified fragments should be indicated from the side of the band with arrowheads, etc in Figure 3.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yuko Yamamoto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Japan</b>