

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103374
Title of the Manuscript:	Association and path coefficient analysis in F2 population of tomato cross Anagha x IHR 2896
Type of the Article	Association and path coefficient analysis among F2 segregating population of Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)

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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript has contribution for the society 2. Association and path coefficient analysis among F2 segregating population of Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) 3. In the abstract the background and problem statement should be added 4. I think the subsection; supplementary section might be added for planting materials since it is very bulky. Regarding the structure either put the result table immediately after the text of the result or put in the appendix subsection 5. If all the comments given are incorporated, it is good 6. The source of information should be added. The style of referencing should be corrected 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I have also tried to correct grammar so follow the author so as to fulfil the English quality	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Attention should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap of the study • Materials part lacks many things as I have listed there • Discussion part is very shallow • In the result part text and result table should be side by side if not put in appendix • Referencing style should be according to internationally accepted manner as I have mentioned 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bullo Neda Tulu
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia