

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_124800
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of viruses infecting tomatoes in Cross River State and its effect on selected growth parameters
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	The study has practical implications aiding for successful tomato cultivation. The study indicated the survey at the regions of Cross River State indicating the severity of the viral infestation at the regions. However, some alternative suggestions to prevent the infestation was also given.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be rephrased (example- Impact of Viral Pathogens on Tomato Growth and Yield in Cross River State: Focus on Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus (TSWV))	
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 was good but could be improvised by including the treatment details.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Yes, the results were properly given. The author also grouped the results supporting the data statistically. The ELISA method of the viral detection forms the viable part of the manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references were sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language was good but could be improvised for attracting the global audience	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	But could be improvised by adding further observations after 9 th day after planting. Further, a photograph could be added to differentiate the viral infestation. The details of treatments and statistical method used was not mentioned in materials and methods	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Malepati S N V S Sripriya Bhargavi
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India