

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_107439</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Correlation Analysis for Yield and Yield Contributing Traits among Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) Genotypes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article is important for the scientific community, it frames a series of relationships that express the meaning of the research.</li> <li>2. The title is appropriate for the research carried out.</li> <li>3. The summary should express more and better the results obtained and not be so general.</li> <li>4. However, some structures can be improved, such as the introduction, where the objective of the research is not clearly observed. Likewise, materials and methods should be more exhaustive to explain the development of the procedure. The results could be expressed with tables or graphs that can better represent them, the discussion should also be expanded and improved and finally it would be important to give greater force to the theory part, increasing the number of citations.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is indeed correct, if it overcomes all the suggested observations.</li> <li>6. It is suggested to increase the number of citations and their references, in addition to looking for the most current ones.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	If it is appropriate, you can clearly understand what you want to explain about the research.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Sernaque Aucchuasi, Fernando Antonio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federico Villarreal National University, Peru</b>