

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_108813
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC DIVERSITY IN <i>Sphenostylis stenocarpa</i> (HOCHST EX. A RICH HARMS) USING MORPHOLOGICAL MARKERS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the article provided baseline information for efficient characterization of <i>S. sternocarpa</i>.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>Yes, abstract of the article is all-encompassing but still requires revision. Yes, the subsections and structure are good, except that the "Introduction" was replaced with "Background of the Study" and the Results were not well organised.</p> <p>Yes it is scientifically all right but was poorly written. Only the these citations: Abdulkareem <i>et al.</i>, 2015, BI, 2009, Togun & Ejunjobi, 2007, NRC, 2006, Aremu and Ibirinde (2012), Popoola <i>et al.</i> (2011), Maiti <i>et al.</i>, 1994, Gonzaloz-Andres and Ortiz, 1995, were present both in the in the body of the work and at the Reference list. All other citations in the body of the work were absent in the Reference list. Moreover, majority of the references were not in the body of the work but seemed to have been copied from elsewhere and pasted in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>D, EMinor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Major revision is need in this work. The research was well done but poorly reported, hence, vague. In addition, it was not well organised and the quality of English is poor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is original and the technicality is adequate. The author(s) did not do a proper literature review and the English quality is poor. The manuscript will be good for publication when the major revisions stipulated are successfully done.</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:	Chinelo A. Ezeabara
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria