

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127224
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical change in Hybrid Tomato Production- A Field Based Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript provides a valuable analysis of output growth in hybrid tomato production across three varieties in Vijayapur District. Its comparative approach offers insights into the performance of Arka Vishall, Arka Vikas, and Arka Vardan, which can guide farmers in making better crop choices. The study is relevant and contributes to enhancing agricultural productivity and decision-making.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and descriptive but could be made more concise while retaining its focus. A possible alternative could be: "Comparative Analysis of Output Growth in Hybrid Tomato Varieties: Arka Vishall, Arka Vikas, and Arka Vardan in Vijayapur District"	
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.	Insufficient. The author should adhere to a structure that captures the objective, methodology, findings, and recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Somehow, subsections such as discussion, recommendations, and demographic characteristics of farmers are missing. In addition, a detailed account of the study area, study design, and sampling procedures needs to be presented.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound, using a clear approach to analyze the sources of output growth in hybrid tomato production. The study provides a well-rounded view of productivity changes by assessing technology and input growth. The methodology, including evaluating inputs like labor, manure, and irrigation, is based on reliable data. Comparing three different tomato hybrids adds value, offering practical insights into the performance of each variety and highlighting areas for future improvement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author needs to compare the findings of this study with those of other scholars. This comparison will provide a foundation for the discussion in the paper and introduce new references. Additionally, the author should include citations for the statements made in the manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This work contains numerous grammatical errors that need correction before publication.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	While this paper has merit, the author should review the recommendations for enhancement provided in the document.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dickson Utonga
Department, University & Country	Tengeru Institute of Community Development, Tanzania