

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 Article

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

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript effectively tackles the challenge of duplicate identification in mulberry germplasm using a combination of physical traits and genetic tools. Its practical approach supports efficient conservation and resource management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is clear and accurately reflects the study's focus and methods.	
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.	The abstract is clear but could be more concise and engaging. Germplasm collections often contain duplicates, increasing maintenance costs without adding diversity. This study focused on identifying duplicates in 312 mulberry accessions using 17 morphological descriptors and 12 SSR markers. Cluster analysis flagged 84 suspected duplicates, and molecular screening confirmed 14 true duplicates. By combining traditional and molecular methods, the study offers an efficient approach to conserving unique genetic materials and optimizing resource management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Plant Material Collection: Specify the collection site (CSGRC, Hosur), sampling method, and number of mulberry accessions studied. Morphological Analysis: Briefly outline the 17 descriptors used, evaluation protocol, and data recording methods. Molecular Analysis: Summarize DNA extraction, SSR marker selection, PCR conditions, and genotyping techniques. Data Analysis: Mention the clustering method, software used, and criteria for identifying duplicates.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically solid, focusing on a key issue—identifying duplicates in mulberry germplasm. By combining morphological traits with SSR markers, it ensures accurate results, overcoming environmental factors. The study's use of cluster analysis adds depth, making the findings reliable. Overall, the approach is practical and directly relevant to improving germplasm management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	To ensure the references are sufficient and recent, it's important to include studies from the last 3-5 years, especially on SSR markers and mulberry germplasm management. Adding recent reviews or advancements in molecular techniques would strengthen the manuscript and keep it current.	
Minor REVISION comments	The language is likely suitable if it's clear and precise. If there are any complex sentences or unclear terms, simplifying them would improve readability for a scholarly audience.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript tackles an important issue in germplasm management with a solid approach, combining both morphological and molecular techniques. To strengthen it, consider refining the language for clarity, updating references, and ensuring detailed methodology. Overall, it's a valuable contribution to germplasm conservation.	

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:	Sofia S
Department, University & Country	Fatima Mata National College (Autonomous), India