

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99183
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening Solanum germplasm (Tomato and Brinjal) and identify rootstocks for resistance to Fusarium wilt
Type of the 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)	The overall outcome is important for disease management. I Think it should be concise and clear. I have made comments in manuscripts It need to be improved according to the comments on manuscript. It need to be improved. Some correction should be made. Some citation is lacking and recent references should be included.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It need to be improved.	
Optional/General comments	The way of writing and arrangement of manuscript has not been scientific. The methodology is not sufficient and clear. A lot of work should be done as pointed in 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prakash Ghimire
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Sciences, Nepal