

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98558
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF GROWTH AND POLLEN VIABILITY (FERTILITY) IN RELATION TO FRUIT SET AMONG FIVE VARIETIES OF TOMATO
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the results are interesting and should be available</p> <p>No, in my opinion, the location of the experimental fields should be included, as «EVALUATION OF GROWTH AND POLLEN VIABILITY (FERTILITY) IN RELATION TO FRUIT SET AMONG FIVE VARIETIES (or cultivars?) OF TOMATO in Gwalior, India» The abstract should be improved, it had orthographic errors, and doesn't include all the major results</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The written manuscript, in my opinion, must be improved, but is scientifically correct (see comments in the manuscript)</p> <p>No, some sentences need further bibliographic references. Most of the references along the text were not listed in the final list, all should be included. Most of the references included in the final list aren't included in the body text. Most of the references aren't recent, but a 2021 reference was also included. The references in the final list aren't correctly presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Improvements are required (included in the attached file)	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments are on the manuscript. These are the most important issues:</p> <p>1- Improve English (use past sentences): all over the document.</p> <p>2- Some sentences in the introduction should be clarified or moved to materials and methods section.</p> <p>3- References: some sentences need further bibliographic references. Most of the references along the text were not listed in the final list, all should be included. Most of the references included in the final list aren't included in the body text. Most of the references aren't recent. The references in the final list aren't correctly presented.</p> <p>4- ANOVA results should be included in the tables, knowing if the varieties differ among each other with statistical significance ($p < 0,05$) is important.</p> <p>5- Use unities in all table columns</p> <p>6- Figures aren't mentioned in the text as it should. The presented images were not obtained with the same magnifying glass, which difficult comparisons. The quality of the images should also be better (if possible)</p> <p>The 5 tomatoes studied are varieties or cultivars? If they are cultivars manuscript title should be rephrased</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:

Name:	Orlanda Viamonte Póvoa
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre, Portugal