

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_102926
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYLOGENETIC ANALYSIS OF ACACIA NILOTICA AND COFFEA ARABICA USING PROTEIN SEQUENCE FROM CHLOROPLAST rbcL GENE
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.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The main aim of this manuscript is incorrectly set (to assess generic and interspecific differences between <i>Acacia nilotica</i> and <i>Coffea arabica</i> based on the protein sequence of rbcL). It goes without saying that the distances between species of different genera are be greater than those of subspecies of the same species. Consequently, the results are neither scientifically important nor interesting.</p> <p>The title is suitable, though this article is not original research paper because all data used in the analysis were downloaded from GenBank.</p> <p>The abstract is too extended.</p> <p>The structure of this manuscript is not appropriate, because the authors did not use the Paper Template and did not follow the Author Guidelines at all. Consequently, citations in the text were not indicated by the reference number in brackets; all subsections were not numbered; the list of References is disorganized and inconsistent; Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions are missing.</p> <p>In addition, Literature review must be added to Introduction; the Results and Discussion sections should be merged together; most of the Discussion and Conclusions sections should be moved to other sections; Methodology, Results and Discussion must be greatly expanded and improved. The Plates 1, 2, and the Figure 1 do not add any information and are therefore redundant; the Figures 2 and 3 are the same; the data of Appendix 1 should be included into Figures; the titles of figures should be expanded.</p> <p>This manuscript is not scientifically correct, because one part of results is misleading ("the sequences generated from rbcL also indicated that <i>Acacia nilotica</i> and <i>Coffea arabica</i> are monophyletic" – according to the NJ and ML trees, these species are polyphyletic), while the other part is fundamentally obvious ("... the species of <i>A. nilotica</i> and <i>C. arabica</i> ... share a common ancestor" – all species have derived from the same ancestor, the question is how long ago they diverged; "<i>Acacia nilotica</i> ssp. <i>subalata</i> and <i>Acacia nilotica</i> ssp. <i>hemispherica</i> are closely related" – like it should be in the subspecies of the same species). In that way all this research is pointless. The references are sufficient. However, the list is messy and out of order.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript contains many typographical and factual errors. The English needs checking by a native speaker because some sentences are difficult to understand (e. g., "<i>Acacia nilotica</i> has higher bootstrap values than <i>Coffea arabica</i> making the evolutionary sense between the two genuses").</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants was not taken into account.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Svetlana Orlovskytė
Department, University & Country	Nature Research Centre, Lithuania