

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_121890</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Screening of tomato varieties/hybrids against aphid (<i>Aphis gossypii</i> Glover) under field condition</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important to the scientific community for several key reasons. First, it contributes to research on crop resistance to pests, a crucial area for improving the sustainability and profitability of agricultural production. By identifying varieties/hybrids that are less susceptible to aphids, this study offers concrete avenues for reducing the use of insecticides and minimising crop losses due to this specific pest.</p> <p>I particularly appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous methodology, which includes a randomised block design and detailed observations over several years. This reinforces the reliability of the obtained results and their practical applicability under real field conditions. In addition, our in-depth discussion of the results in relation to previous studies enriches our understanding of the genetic variability of tomato responses to aphids.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the current article, "Screening of tomato varieties/hybrids against aphid (Aphis gossypii Glover) under field condition", is appropriate because it clearly describes the main subject of the study, namely the evaluation of tomato varieties/hybrids against the aphid Aphis gossypii under field conditions.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The summary of the article is fairly comprehensive as it provides a clear overview of the study on screening tomato varieties/hybrids against aphids under field conditions.</p> <p>This section briefly describes the number of varieties/hybrids tested, the aphid susceptibility levels observed, and the main results concerning aphid populations among the different varieties/hybrids. However, to improve the summary, a brief mention of the methodology used in the research could be added to enable readers to understand how the study was conducted (e.g. location/area of study, experimental set-up, etc.)</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The general structure of the manuscript is as follows: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and References. However, a few suggestions can improve clarity and flow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Introduction:</b> This section is well detailed but could be slightly condensed by focusing more on the specific context of the study, i.e. aphid resistance.</li> <li>2. <b>Materials and Methods:</b> The description of materials and methods is adequate, but it might be useful to clearly separate the subsections on variety selection, experimental design, and criteria for measuring aphid populations for better organisation.</li> <li>3. <b>Results:</b> The results are presented in detail with tables and statistical analysis, which is appropriate for this section.</li> <li>4. <b>Discussion:</b> The discussion is substantial and adequately discusses the results in relation to other similar studies. Consider incorporating more of the practical implications of the results and identifying gaps that may require future research.</li> <li>5. <b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion effectively summarises the main findings of the study. You might consider adding a practical recommendation based on the findings.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness through its methodical approach to screening tomato varieties and hybrids for aphid resistance under field conditions. The study employed a Randomised Block Design with appropriate replication, spacing, and data collection methods to ensure reliable results. Additionally, the categorisation of varieties/hybrids based on aphid population levels and statistical analysis of data across two consecutive years enhances the scientific rigour of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>⊃</p>	<p>The document references are sufficient. They have the advantage of being more recent, which reinforces the originality of this study. The oldest reference dates from 2016. However, there are certain parts to correct :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference "Bugti et al. 2016" is in the text but not in the reference section;</li> <li>• It is necessary to harmonise the year of publication of "Shahrin et al., 2022" in the text and reference section.</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Based on the content provided in the document, the language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The text is structured in a formal and academic tone, presenting the research findings and methodology clearly. However, for a more detailed evaluation of language quality, a thorough proofreading or language editing process may be beneficial to ensure precision and clarity in scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Based on the content snippets provided in the document, the article appears to focus on a specific research study investigating the screening of tomato varieties/hybrids against aphids under field conditions. The approach and methodology described suggest a level of originality in addressing the susceptibility of different varieties and hybrids to aphid infestation.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Belem Adama</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso</b>