

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123490
Title of the Manuscript:	Adaptation of Newly Released Open Pollinated Tomato ( <i>Lycopersicon Esculentum</i> Mill.) varieties in Northwestern zone of Tigray
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)
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.	The overall vision of the present work is promising. However, the authors must make MAJOR revisions, particularly regarding the claims of adaptation. Only after these major revisions will the manuscript be considered for publication. In its current form, it is not ready for the publication process	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The word 'adaptation' does not align with the results. I suggest the authors focus on identifying the best-yielding variety of tomatoes to be selected for cultivation	
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 also needs to be revised in accordance with the comments provided in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are generally well-structured but require corrections based on the provided comments	
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.	The methodology and results do not support the claims of adaptation. However, the work holds scientific value for agronomically important crops. The authors must revise the manuscript by refining the objectives accordingly	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references generally support the discussion; however, the authors should include additional relevant references on similar or closely related studies on tomatoes to better justify their outcomes and highlight potential future applications.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I believe the manuscript requires a MAJOR revision before it can proceed to the next stage of the review process. SEE ATTACHMENT	

#### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shrayan Bhattacharjee
Department, University & Country	Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Centenary College (Autonomous), India