

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105381
Title of the Manuscript:	Multivariate analysis for Post harvest quality and yield attributes in tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject/work is of importance in the field of agronomy; however, it requires review for editorial errors; It is recommended to take care of the shape and style. 2. The title of the work seems appropriate to me. 3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, taking care of the order of the ideas; emphasizing what the work contributes (results). 4. The sections and structure are correct, except take care of the style; and in each of these avoid repeating information. 5. The work can be improved both in substance (content) and in the form of writing. 6. In the references section, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references. <p>It is necessary that the authors improve the structure of the Results and discussion section, this section must be more consistent; that the parameters evaluated are compared (with treatments or results), with similar studies in the same site or with other studies at an international level.</p> <p>It is necessary for the authors to review and adapt the manuscript with respect to the form of citation, in each of the paragraphs they support, and include references to those that are missing (according to the guide of the journal, or with the characteristics of how it should appear)</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work:</p> <p>Supplementing broiler feed with 200 mg of ascorbic acid per kg boosted growth and FCR [7,8,10,12,13]. According to Sahin et al. [14], supplementing with either vitamin C or chromium led to better live weight gain, feed efficiency, and carcass traits and reduced blood corticosterone and MDA concentrations. Sujatha et al. [15] found that oxidative stress in broilers might be alleviated...</p> <p>In the manuscript some details are marked (in color - underlined), which must be taken care of, among others.</p> <p>References should be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order in which they appear in the text. Any reference referred to in the text must also appear in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated with the reference number in parentheses [5]. All references must follow the following style. Necessary suggestions to carry out.</p> <p><u>Reference to a journal:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Olagunju AT, Morgan JA, Aftab A, Gatchel JR, Chen P, Dols A, Sajatovic M, Regenold WT. A Review of the Evidence Base for Nutrition and Nutritional Supplements in Older Adults with Bipolar Disorder: A report from the OABD task force. J Frailty Aging. 2021;10(3):241-246. doi: 10.14283/jfa.2020.64. 2. Boyle NB, Lawton C, Dye L. The Effects of Magnesium Supplementation on Subjective Anxiety and Stress-A Systematic Review. Nutrients. 2017;9(5):429. doi: 10.3390/nu9050429. <p><u>Reference to a book:</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>1. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p> <p>Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles.</p> <p>1. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is recommended to take care of the style of the manuscript (form and background), annotations are made on the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Where available, the URLs of the references are provided. The text must comply with the style and bibliographic requirements described in the guidelines for authors.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of The State of Mexico, México