

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
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

Compulsory 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.	The main objective of the manuscript is not at all clear. Is this the first time the marketing suitability of all these varieties being evaluated or are the authors re-evaluating already popular varieties? From the Introduction and the Discussion, it seems like these varieties are already popular in the masses. If so, then the study is basically confirmation of a popular opinion. On the other hand, if it is evaluated the first time, and it is really important to do so, the study undersells the fact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title should reflect the above evaluation and be more tuned to the direct results obtained from the study, to properly reflect the importance of the work done. A suggestive title can be something to the tune of: x proves to be highest yielding among the newly released Open-pollinated varieties of Tomato in ...	
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 results part of the Abstract is too confusing to follow. Either it needs to be simplified or properly broken down with clear English	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, there should not be a one-liner objective section. It should be the last paragraph of Introduction. Also, the Conclusion section should not repeat all the Results, all over again	
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 manuscript is not at all scientifically robust. Firstly, the properties differentiating the different varieties, their optimal conditions and phenotypic and genotypic differences are not mentioned neither in the Introduction (where it should be), not even in Discussion Secondly, Objective is not clearly defined. There is no backing as to why the Objective is important. What are the expectations. Just repeating over and over, the importance of Tomato and tomato cultivation does not justify the study Thirdly, the experimental design is not properly explained, nor the environmental conditions for the study. Crucial details are missing about the plot conditions. More importantly, it seems the authors have same experimental conditions for all the varieties, thereby biasing results against varieties growing under sub-optimal conditions, thereby have a flawed experimental design. Fourthly, although the authors mention differential growth and performance of different varieties under different environmental conditions, the authors have never interpreted their results in that context. This is crucial since there can be no one-size-fits-all variety. Rather the results should have been discussed as x variety performed well under y conditions. Also the statistical interpretations are incorrect	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.:-	Yes, it is not a primary concern here	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not at all. Too many grammatical mistakes, improper usage of terms in scientific context and variable representation of same roper names throughout the manuscript	
Optional/General comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Souparna Chakrabarty
Department, University & Country	Sloan Kettering Institute, United States