

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124917
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of water regime and organic amendment on agromorphological parameters of tomato ( <i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) grown in the open field on gleysol in Diabo department, central Côte d'Ivoire.
Type of the Article	Research article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Tomato cultivation in Cote d'Ivoire is a recent crop. The assessment of the degree of adaptability of the crop and the search for good agricultural practices (irrigation and amendment) are two important steps in developing this crop. This manuscript is a step to clarify those points. Agro- morphological parameters are the first parameters to follow to judge the behavior of the species in its environment. I believe that this article can take place as a contribution to understand the behavior of this species.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is clearly written and it gives a general idea about the manuscript. I think that if we delete those words (objective, place and duration, methodology, results, conclusion), the abstract becomes better than it is now</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>They are appropriate and I don't find problems with them</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Personally, I found that the work is good and we can say rich. The parameters chosen can be improved by measuring the leaf surface. In other hand, the growth and development parameters were determined only at the maturity stage. I preferred that the parameters were measured in the vegetative stage also. So we were able to follow an evolution. Generally, it's an acceptable work that can give us a clear idea.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I found that the references are sufficient and relatively recent.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some errors in English must be corrected such 'fertilisers,number....', but I believe that in scientific review we must not write the scientific name of species wrong Tomato is <i>Solanum lycopersicum L.</i> As quality of language, it's acceptable and can be published after correction of course.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Sihem Methamem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Agronomic Sciences Chott Mariem, Tunisia</b>