



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_46517 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Selection of eggplant genotypes tolerant to high temperatures. |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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 | Precise introduction, justification and conclusion(s) should be reported in the abstract. Discussions are too scanty. Results should be discuss more and supported with recent citations. References and citations should follow journal guidelines. | <p>Commentaries to the reviewers</p> <p>Dear reviewers, we appreciate your suggestions and we inform you that those have been included in the new version of the article, and we also made some new changes to the initial text.</p> <p>Results and Discussions</p> <p>We rewrote this section, but we emphasize that the work is unprecedented in Brazil, and two or three studies on this subject are found in the international literature (Cited in this work). Therefore, a more detailed discussion with the results of other authors was not possible. However, we highlight that the most recent studies related to the evaluation of eggplant genotypes evaluated in the climatic conditions of Brazil, which include common commercial cultivars, were cited and compared to the results of this study.</p> <p>This work is part of the doctoral thesis of the first author, which has other chapters that will be published briefly. And it has important results for eggplant breeding programs.</p> <p>We thank you and we make ourselves available to new suggestions.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | Minor corrections should be corrected as highlighted and indicated in the manuscript. | |
| Optional/General comments | Introduction and methodology were clear and understandable. Precise introduction, justification and conclusion(s) should be reported in the abstract. Discussions are too scanty. Results should be discuss more and supported with recent citations. References and citations should follow journal guidelines. The manuscript need moderate revisions and corrections before consideration for publication. | |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |