

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_99196
Title of the Manuscript:	Phylogenetic relationships and diversity in <i>Leymus</i> (Poaceae, Triticeae) based on simple sequence repeats 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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It reflects an original research work related mainly to the evaluation of the phylogenetic relationships among some species of the genus <i>Leymus</i> Hochst. The authors used new molecular techniques for the detection of the genomic relationships between these Triticeae species. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is well written and comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Globally, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient but the majority of them are not recent. Please add more recent references or change old ones by recent ones, if possible.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chokri Bayoudh
Department, University & Country	Regional Research Centre on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture, Tunisia