

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99494
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilising inter-Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA, assess genetic variability in indigenous medicinal plant Heart-leaved Moonseed (<i>Tinospora cordifolia</i>)
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Yes because the <i>T. cordifolia</i> has an importance in traditional ayurvedic medicine used for ages in several medicine treatments. The studies about its genetic variability are useful to know the genetic background of the medicinal plants exhibiting high commercial value and high content of active ingredients.</p> <p>2- Yes. Please, see notes attached.</p> <p>3- Yes Please, see notes attached.</p> <p>4- Yes, please see notes attached.</p> <p>5- Yes. Please, see notes attached.</p> <p>6- Yes, it is sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The article should make some correction before publishing</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Line 2: a) Title: Utilising inter-Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA, assess genetic..... No comma after DNA. Add TO after DNA</p> <p>Line 4 add (Willed) after <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i></p> <p>Lines 8-20: This section should contain the body of the article, including a brief statement of the research hypothesis, the methods used, and the results found. Please restructure your manuscript so that it contains these contents.</p> <p>Line 14: substitute the word perseverance to objective or goal.</p> <p>Line 15: The author must clarify whether accessions refer to accessions from the germplasm bank, or varieties. If were varieties, have you used only one in different locations? If so, why do you expected genetic variation?</p> <p>Line 19-20: The fact of having found polymorphism is not a conclusion. The author needs to explore more the results.</p> <p>Line 21: avoid overlapping keywords in your keyword list and those in your title</p> <p>Line 34: use italic for scientific name. The scientific name should generally be written in full when it is first used. After that it may then be abbreviated by just using an initial (and period) for the genus.</p> <p>Lines 39, 40, 41: Use technical vocabulary instead colloquial one (perseverance, love, amazing, greatest).</p> <p>Line 41: The weather in July to August is different in each location. Please, add the country name.</p> <p>Line 69: The scientific name should generally be written in full when it is first used. After that it may then be abbreviated by just using an initial (and period) for the genus.</p> <p>Line 70: MSL: written in full when it is first used (it was done in line 116)</p> <p>Lines 72-73. What is the rationale for the selection of these places? Some detail should be given as to why they were chosen and what they represent.</p> <p>Line 76: CTAB is a protocol, not a technique. Please provide full name of it.</p> <p>Line 77: The scientific name should generally be written in full when it is first used. After that it may then be abbreviated by just using an initial (and period) for the genus.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The age of collected leaves must be described (days after planting) or stage of development. Line 97: Gene Ruler. Please include both the manufacturer's name and location (including city, state, and country) for specialized equipment, software, and reagents. Line 102: MVSP (please write in full) Line 105: 152 plant species instead 152 species Lines 108-111: consider to rewrite this because there is no meaning here. Lines 113-130. This must be moved to material and methods section. Line 132. Italic Line 158: the figures show that..... Line 177: the result must be quantified (not be good or bad). Please, provide a quantified parameter. Line 179: please provide reference for Alfaview Line 196: Italic Line 201: "being distant"-the results must be numerically quantified Lines 215-219: DNA quantity and quality is not a result. Lines 214-224: The fact that plants originating from different areas present various degrees of polymorphism does not mean that there is genetic variability among them. The results must be better explored to arrive at the answer that the author is looking for. Overall, these findings suggest that there is considerable genetic diversity within T. cordifolia accessions from Tamil Nadu. However, the author does not mention the importance of these findings to genetic diversity for this species to the breeding programme or other aspect of the plant production such as if would provides a major input into conservation biology, etc.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rosangela Bevitori
Department, University & Country	Embrapa Arroz e Feijão, Brazil