

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97100
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of performance for the quantitative traits in tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicon</i> L.) over seasons
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.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)
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 introduction of successful and productive hybrid species is one of the important achievements for the scientific community to improve the level of sustainable agriculture to provide food for the population that is currently increasing. It can also become an idea to prevent hunger caused by the lack of suitable land for cultivation and the optimal use of current suitable land. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. Although the abstract of the article is comprehensive in describing aims, methods, and results, it does not have any suggestions for scientific community or other beneficiaries. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. Conclusion section is completely forgotten. In introduction section, only 2 references are used for literature review, clarifying the aims, and the importance of conducting the study. In material and methods section, lack of clear method (statistical test for comparing means) is observed. Also, lack of good discussion is observed in results and discussions section (The results were not compared in details with other researches and also authors did not explain their expert opinions about their findings). 5. The obtained results of manuscript are scientifically correct. 6. Although the references are recent, they are insufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article contained some grammatical and orthographical errors.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sayyed Mahmoud Enjavinezhad
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Shiraz University, Iran