

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121731
Title of the Manuscript:	Utility of Parthenocarpy in Vegetable Crops: A review
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The issue of genetic diversity is controversial. It is complicated to occur naturally, most of the time it is induced. It can be seen as something positive or negative, as discussed in the article. Some view less genetic diversity as a negative, while you could also see it as a positive.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>You must check separations, double points, spaces, there are typographical errors. It is difficult to read without separations between titles, tables, texts. It is recommended to rewrite the summary. The same thing is repeated several times with other words. The abstract will collect, in a concise and simplified way, three key aspects of the research: Research, What you have done (results) How you did it (methodology) and What you have achieved (conclusions)</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is not correct. The correct structure is: Introduction, materials and methods, results and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table. Correct sizes of titles and subtitles. There are titles of one size and the following ones of another size. some in lowercase and some in uppercase.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>As stated in the conclusions, it is a very initial article, it comments on a "parthenocarp" production system but very succinct, very general. Deeper and more extensive applied research is needed. It is an investigation that can be decisive and necessary in certain places in the world. It has the drawback of morality, if it is understood as playing with nature. Good work is being done that must continue.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>It is advisable that references are no more than 8-10 years old. Except one or two if its use is extremely important. It is suggested to carry out a bibliographic review of the studies published in the last 10 years and update the references in the text. The number of references is correct. Unify text, there are references to the author in one line and in the next, the text of the text. Correct separations, bold, periods, commas.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations... - It would be interesting to give some more data in the conclusion, more information about the result obtained. Explain a little more the good results obtained. - It is interesting to comment that the study will continue. As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Noé Anes García
Department, University & Country	University Oviedo, Spain