

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125097
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicon</i> Mill.) genotypes for morphological and disease resistance traits through cluster analysis
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Overall, this type of manuscript is good. However, I think this type of paper needs more characterization and more parameters. This is because just characterization of disease resistance through only clusters doesn't make sense. After all, there are other parameters affecting this.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good	
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.	The abstract is good but I didn't see the suggestion that much with results. Also, the methodology in the abstract needs more detail.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is good but I didn't see the conclusion	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are about 238 grammar mistakes in the manuscript. • Methods and materials need to be written again. • Section (Hierarchical Cluster Analysis (HCA) needs to be written again. • There is no good interpretation of the results. • The discussion need more supports 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think the references are enough but most of them are old. They should use more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs to be corrected because as I said there are about 240 grammar mistakes.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammed Saeed Rasheed
Department, University & Country	Halabja Technical College, Sulaimani Polytechnic University, Iraqi Kurdistan