

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_98801
Title of the Manuscript:	Deciphering the Genetic Identity and Fidelity of Banana Genotype Musa Acuminata through Molecular Fingerprinting
Type of the 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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite this manuscript shows an obvious application of molecular markers for genetic verification of clonal or somatic variants during plant in vitro culture, the manuscript requires several improvements and organization to show coherently their results. The same idea was already published in several references, then, the authors must show why their research is different, for example, the cultivar G-9.</li> <li>No, the manuscript title should be rewritten. First, adequate words must be chosen to avoid confusion. The genetic identity and fidelity are not deciphered in this research, it is just confirmed or not confirmed. Another consideration is that "<i>Musa acuminata</i>" should be clarified as from in vitro culture, since one of the research objectives was "Micropropagation of banana genotype Grand Naine (G-9)". Research title from Choudhary et al (2015) should be considered as a suitable model for the title of this manuscript.</li> <li>The manuscript abstract is comprehensive; although, no abbreviations or acronyms should be used, such as: "BAP", "IBA", "SSR", among others.</li> <li>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. Except the "Statistical analysis" and "Data analysis" from Materials and methods section. Those are not consistent with the results, i.e., no results are shown after the analyses.</li> <li>The manuscript is scientifically correct, but research hypothesis and objectives are not well organized in the manuscript. It should state both in vitro micropropagation and molecular marker aimed to determine genetic identity/fidelity.</li> <li>Some of the references are relevant.</li> <li>The research objectives must be consistent with the rest of the manuscript. Moreover, they must show statistical support of, at least, in vitro procedures and molecular markers use. The mere presentation of monomorphic bands in some PAGE gels (some of the bands are not clearly visible) could not be sufficient to say clonality is maintained. Besides, informative loci must be identified, or use reported ones, that can be amplified and shown to be the same in every subculture.</li> <li>In Fig 4, the band pattern does not coincide between subculture samples and control (G-9)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The English in this manuscript should be reviewed. There are some confusing words and orthographic errors in the text.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	There are several comments and suggestions in the manuscript.	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Julio Alfonso Chia Wong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Agraria de la Selva, Perú</b>