

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_97960
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic Analysis for Improving Handling Systems of Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>) in the Menoua Division, West Region of Cameroon
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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		
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript provides basic information for researches on postharvest technology of tomatoes. 2. The title is too long, preferably shorten it. 3. The abstract is comprehended, however it is too long; shorten it to 150-200 words. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, however, more intensive review of scientific articles published in scientific journals is required for better discussion of results. 6. Some more references of scientific articles are required. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
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:	Prabowo Tjitropranoto
Department, University & Country	IPB University, Indonesia