

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124266
Title of the Manuscript:	Ampelographic diversity assessment of local grape varieties grown under Indian condition
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript deals with the characterization by ampelography of a small population of local grapevines from India. The population consists of twenty grape types, both white and black berry. It is not known if these were traditionally used for berry consumption or for fermentation to obtain wines and spirits. The value of the article is mostly related to the effort in valorising the local grapevine biodiversity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 manuscript is interesting, and it deals with the crucial scientific topic of valorising the endemic plant resources. Grapevine (<i>Vitis vinifera</i> L.) is a strategic crop for many countries, both in Europe and in other continents. The manuscript lacks a rigorous description of the methodology that was followed to describe the phenotype diversity. The grapevine types are not thoroughly described in Table 1 (please, consider adding colour berry, age, geographic origin, grafted or not, etc.), and the pictures (which should be improved in the graphic quality) refer only to 12 out of 20 grapevines listed. In order to publish the data, the study should be entirely updated according to international guidelines for grapevine identification (https://www.oiv.int/node/3112) to favour the usability of data by the scientific community. In addition, the comparison following a standardized protocol, should be done by groups showing morphological affinities (e.g. black and white berries, types for table consumption vs. those used for fermentation, etc.), against true-to-type accessions and the results should be clearly reported according to the morphology character listed in the OIV guidelines. Finally, the ampelography monitoring should be done multiple times during the plant lifespan and considering the season and phytosanitary conditions. If possible, the use of DNA markers according to the OIV indications, would be of great help to elucidate grapevine genetic identity and decode possible cases of synonymy or misidentification by ampelography only.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It can be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is suitable.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Rita Vignani
Department, University & Country	University of Siena, Italy