

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99256
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of tomato genotypes for growth, yield and quality attributes under eastern dry zone of Karnataka, India
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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 investigation had industrial relevance but the report did not answer the statement of problem. More so, the relevance, importance and justification of the research were not identified. 2. The title of the article should be modified. See manuscript for suggestions 3. The abstract should be modified for the following reasons: i. To be a stand-alone read with clear understanding of the investigation, ii. Taiwan was mentioned as a sample source, that should be corrected, and iii. Proper clarification of the observations recorded. 4. Methodology did not have proper structure. 5. The write up does not present proper information to validate the report. 6. References are recent. Although a thorough literature review is required to obtain adequate information relevant to the investigation.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A proper proof reading is required to eliminate grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	Methodology should have the following structure: i. Research Location ii. Physiological evaluation iii. Sample collection iv. Growth pattern and characterization v. Statistical analysis Each section should have reference(s) or detailed description of experimental activities	

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:	Emoleila Itoandon
Department, University & Country	Almon Research Foundation, India