

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_95068
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of planting time and variety on the growth, development, and yield 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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy>)

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. Farmers faces challenges in tomato production due to pests and diseases. Hence, Identifying appropriate planting time to optimize tomato yields for a given tomato variety/cultivar is an important avenue in minimizing pesticide use in the environment. 2. The title of the article is suitable and tallies with the content of the manuscript 3. The title of the abstract is compressive but the author should consider the reviewers inputs. 4. The subsections and structure are appropriate and clear to follow 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the author should consider the reviewer's inputs 6. The references are sufficient but the author should use more recent references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The English quality is suitable for scholarly work	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Robert Muzira
Department, University & Country	National Agricultural Research Organization, Uganda