

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121037
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Tomato under protected structure: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of tomato cultivation under protected structures. It highlights the benefits of such systems in improving yield, quality, and market value, particularly in challenging climatic conditions. The importance of this manuscript lies in its potential to guide future research and practical applications in sustainable agriculture. The discussion on the comparative performance of tomatoes under open field and protected conditions is particularly valuable for agricultural practitioners and policymakers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. However, a more precise title could be "Review on the Performance of Tomato under Protected Structures."	
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 comprehensive, but it could be improved by including specific results and implications of the reviewed studies. This would give readers a clearer understanding of the manuscript's findings and significance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, the inclusion of a section on the economic implications and practical recommendations for farmers would enhance the manuscript's utility.	
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 robust and technically sound. It systematically reviews existing literature, compares different cultivation methods, and provides clear conclusions based on the evidence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies. However, adding some more recent studies from the last two years would further strengthen the review.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear, but there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need correction. Additionally, some sections are overly verbose and could be condensed for clarity.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript requires significant revisions to address the high similarity index. Proper citation and paraphrasing are essential. Authors should also consider incorporating more recent research findings to enhance the manuscript's relevance. Including visual aids such as tables, charts, or figures summarizing key data from the reviewed studies could enhance the readability and impact of the manuscript.	

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:	Lokendra Khatri
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal