



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRCS_46803 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Genomic DNA diversity analysis of some accessions of Oryza sativa L. for breeding and conservation strategies. |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | While I appreciate the care with which it was carried out, I have several limitations. Reference and writing may be improved. Based on the degree of similarity of targets, both meaning and extensive interpretation may be needed. The content and quality of presentation may be improved. In addition, in the case of tree analysis, in my experience, that is not correct. Scientific novelty and advance may be further improved. | I have done the necessary correction. Thank you. |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |