

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111419
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC DIVERSITY AMONG THE ELITE ROSE (ROSA SPP.) ACCESSIONS USING RAPD MARKERS
Type of the Article	

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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Methodology: The methods used, namely RAPD markers for analyzing genetic diversity, seem appropriate and are executed to a high technical standard. The method details are sufficient to allow experiment reproduction.</p> <p>Results &amp; Discussion: The data presented are well controlled and robust. Authors included relevant and current references. The discussion and conclusions are based on the facts and figures presented. The statistical analysis seems adequate for this study.</p> <p>Conclusion: Conclusions are supported by the data and discussion in the manuscript. Authors provide sufficient evidence for their claims without exaggeration.</p> <p>References: The cited references seem relevant, but not adequate in terms of number or recency; over 80% are older than 10 years. A suggestion is to add more relevant and current references.</p> <p>Constructive Criticism: I suggest the authors emphasize more on the practical implications of their findings in plant breeding and potential applications in genetic diversity conservation.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the understanding of genetic diversity in Rosa spp. and deserves publication after considering the suggested improvements.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruri Melky Laimeheriwa
Department, University & Country	Pattimura University, Indonesia