

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_122916
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic diversity study on <i>Pseudarthria. viscida</i> (L.) Wight & Arnott, a threatened medicinal plant in India using SSR markers
Type of the 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the genetic diversity of <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i>, a threatened medicinal plant with significant value in traditional medicine. The study provides valuable insights into the genetic variations within the species, which is crucial for its conservation and potential use in future breeding programs. However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer explanations and a more rigorous adherence to journal guidelines.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the study on the genetic diversity of <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i>. However, to make it more specific, a possible alternative title could be: "Assessment of genetic diversity in <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i> using SSR markers: implications for conservation and breeding."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is mostly comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, with a logical flow that guides the reader through the study. The organization follows a standard scientific format, which enhances readability and comprehension. However, the discussion section could benefit from being more distinct in its analysis, possibly by separating out key points or creating subheadings for clarity. Overall, the structure supports the content well but could be refined slightly for improved emphasis on the study's main findings and implications.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough methodology, which includes a comprehensive survey of <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i> populations and the use of well-established SSR markers for genetic analysis. The study's statistical analyses, including UPGMA clustering and PCoA, are appropriate and effectively illustrate the genetic diversity among the accessions. Additionally, the discussion is well-supported by relevant literature, providing a clear context for the findings. Overall, the research design and data analysis are rigorous, ensuring reliable and reproducible results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and relevant studies. However, there is room for improvement in ensuring all references are up-to-date. The journal's guidelines state that citations should be indicated by reference numbers in square brackets. In the text, citations are presented with the authors' names and the year of publication, which does not comply with these guidelines. I recommend that the citations be reviewed and adjusted to the correct format of numbers in square brackets, as required by the journal's instructions. The reference list in the manuscript does not follow the journal's required style. Please ensure that all references are formatted according to the journal's guidelines. This includes checking details such as the arrangement of author names, publication years, journal names, and page numbers. Consistent formatting is crucial for adherence to the journal's standards.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally acceptable for scholarly communications. However, there are areas where the clarity and flow of the text could be improved. Some sentences are overly complex and could benefit from simplification for better readability. Additionally, minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies should be addressed to ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards of academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable insights into the genetic diversity of <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i>, which is critical for conservation efforts and future breeding programs. While the study is thorough and well-structured, there are areas that could benefit from additional clarity, particularly in the methodology and discussion sections. Addressing these points would enhance the overall readability and impact of the work. Additionally, ensuring adherence to the journal's formatting guidelines, especially in citations and references, is necessary.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify that the "high level of diversity" refers to the diversity observed in the study and compare it to known benchmarks, if available. 2. Add more specific examples or data comparisons to support the statement about the effectiveness of SSR markers. Clarify the implications of the PIC values in terms of practical applications. 3. Explain why the number of alleles per locus is important for understanding genetic diversity and how it compares with other studies. 4. Discuss the implications of this difference in genetic similarity coefficient values and what it might indicate about the genetic diversity of <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i> compared to other species. 5. Provide additional interpretation or hypothesis for the observed lack of relationship between PCoA and cluster analysis. Explain what this might mean for the understanding of gene flow and genetic diversity in <i>Pseudarthria viscida</i>. <p>No, there are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript. The research appears to have been conducted ethically, with appropriate consideration for the conservation of the species studied and adherence to scientific guidelines.</p> <p>There are no apparent competing interest issues in this manuscript.</p> <p>There is no evidence of plagiarism in the manuscript based on the provided content.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Zuleide Silva de Carvalho</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Federal University of Recôncavo da Bahia, Brazil</p>