



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_47740
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Heterosis in Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper was concerned with Estimation of Heterosis in Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.), which was conducted by traditional methodology and the content of which is better. Major revisions must be made as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract part is not attractive. 2. Introduction: need to review specific and recent literature on the topic of research. Don't use plagiarized material and old references. 3. Materials and methods very lengthy need to rewrite again. 4. Significant results but discussion level is low in general. A more care-full wording/construction of the sentences could facilitate the reading and improve the paper; 5. The recent related progress in the field was not introduced well in combination with the recent references; 6. References repeat much time in the text e.g. Patwary et al. repeated more than 10 time 7. In this manuscript not follow author guideline in the reference list 8. More important/recent references can be added to the manuscript; 9. English expression needs major improvement; 	<p>Manuscript was revised as per editor comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract part was changed as per suggestions 2. Relevant literature added in the introduction part 3. Materials and methods part shortened as per suggestions 4. discussion part was improved as per comments 5. Recent references included accordingly 6. References checked and reduced repeated one 7. Manuscript revised with author guidelines
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>