

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_127370
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of duplicates in mulberry germplasm using morphological descriptors and SSR markers
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	To much background information in the abstract Add more information about the methodology Highlights some important results Add a conclusive sentence about the importance/implication of the finding	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, some the figures in the method section should be in the results, similarly the statistical analysis section should be moved to method section from the result. Methods and Results section shall be organized in a similar way The morphological results shall be described in the results section Many of the figures has not been described in the results Please discuss whether the morphological and molecular findings match with each other	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The concept and methodology followed in this study is consistent which provided some important information about the duplication of genebanks. It has combined both morphological and molecular techniques to confirm the results (which has not been addressed properly in the manuscript)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Okay, but I did not crossmatch with the text.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some grammatical error found, revising them would increase the clarity.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Masudur Rahman
Department, University & Country	Sylhet Agricultural University, Bangladesh