

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 manuscript can prove to be important for the scientific community and for the farmers and to improve the yield and productivity of the tomato crop in the regions under study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for the present manuscript, however, the word evaluation or its synonym may be added to make more clarity of the research	
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.	Abstract needs to be corrected although very small corrections are needed, the points are mentioned in the comments in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are almost correct, very few corrections are need and those are mentioned in the comments in the manuscript as there are unnecessary lines added which needs to be removed to make the manuscript precise	
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 scientifically correct and it can be crucial for the scientific community and the farmers for carrying improving the yield and productivity and also in further varietal improvement programme	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent. However, some latest references will make the manuscript much better.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is appropriate for scholarly communications.	
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:	Udit Joshi
Department, University & Country	Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, India