

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_97342
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of genetic diversity of sesame (Sesamum indicum L.) genotypes, using agro morphological and molecular markers (RAPD)
Type of the Article	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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4. 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 genotypes of Sesam are scientifically important as a main oilseed crop in that region.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, it is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, except that the methodological part of DNA extraction should be improved as it is pointed out in the manuscript (model of the device used, the conditions of the experiment, the equipment used). Also, mathematical symbols are sometimes missed, the characters are sometimes mixed. Please be attentive to improve your statistical part.</p> <p>The references could be sufficient but are not really recent (1958), if there are no more fresh ones on that topic.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is inconvincible to write so much statistics, but not to describe sufficiently the experiment itself. Please improve the methodological part named DNA molecular analysis and especially the part of RAPD assay as although you gave the reference, it is still needed to point out the conditions you used, the device exactly you used, the model of the device, a type of the equipment you have got for your PCR (please, see the comments written in red in the manuscript). For ex., "for protein assay we used the spectrophotometer Cary 100 (Varian, USA) at 280 nm and then calculated by Calcar (ref. No)."</p> <p>If the corrections required are made, the manuscript will be suitable for publishing in the journal:</p> <p>Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yuliya Preobrazhenskaya
Department, University & Country	Yanka Kupala State University of Grodno, Belarus