

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121317
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability Studies for Growth, Yield and Quality Traits in Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) Germplasm
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 (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 manuscript presents results obtained from a genetic and morphological evaluation of tomato genotypes. The plant material, from a desert area of India, could be of particular interest because it is still poorly characterized and potentially rich in genetic variability. However, the lack of clear information on how morphological and genetic markers were assessed makes the experiment non-repeatable and non-comparable with the existing literature on the subject.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear but I would have added an indication of the country of origin of the plant material.	
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 is clear and comprehensive. As indicated in the notes in the text, it is important to use an internationally recognized method for identifying seasons and indicating the meaning of acronyms when first reported.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are correct but they need to be improved.	
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 title and abstract of the manuscript refer to a genetic and phenotypic analysis of tomato genotypes. However, genetic evaluation methods are not mentioned at all in the materials and methods. Were molecular markers used? If so which ones? If plant morphology measurements were made, the methods and a clear list of the traits evaluated should be indicated. References about evaluation of genetic and phenotypic variability should also be included in the introduction section. In addition, the discussion should be extensively reviewed considering the extensive world literature available on tomatoes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Tomato is a widely studied species of interest worldwide. The bibliography cited is lacking in international references literature and focuses mainly on work at the local level. An extensive review of the bibliography would be needed that would allow comparison of the work done with similar work done on other tomato genotypes.	
Minor REVISION comments	Revision of English by a native English speaker is necessary.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The present work considers a widely studied species such as tomato, and the methods used, while applied to potentially interesting plant material, are not innovative. For these reasons, it is more important to structure the work in a way that adds value to the scientific community.	

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>	No ethical issues

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isabella Mascio
Department, University & Country	University of Bari, Italy