



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_45766
Title of the Manuscript:	In vivo effect of aqueous extract of Moringa leaves on postharvest shelf life and quality of tomato fruits inoculated with fungal pathogens
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Title should be "To study the effect of <i>Moringa oleifera</i> leaves extract of tomato fruits inoculated with fungal pathogens during post harvest conditions".</p> <p>Abstract: line # 2: fungal pathogens were determined. line # 8: change into 80 and 100% w/v concentrations instead of 80g/ml and 100g/ml</p> <p>Materials and methods: Remove 2.1,2.2,2.3 and 2.4</p> <p><b>COLLECTION AND PREPARATION OF LEAVES EXTRACT:</b> Fresh leaves of <i>M. oleifera</i> were collected from different locations in Makurdi metropolis and dried aseptically, with the help of blender grind into fine powder and stored in jar. Dried leaves powder (100g) were soaked into 100ml sterilize distilled water for 12 hours and filter it through muslin cloth. The filtrate obtained in the beaker known as stock solution (100% w/v) which was further diluted with sterilize distilled water making 80% w/v concentration. Remove all the tables and I have send the attachment copy of tables, the author is requested to put the readings in the given format table. The results should be in precise form. The author is requested to kindly do correction, along with it I have send the table format.</p>	<p>The suggested topic is completely off point and is contrary to the message the manuscript is trying to pass across.</p> <p>80 and 100 w/v is same as 80g/ml and 100g/ml. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 are very crucial to understanding the steps in the materials and methods. Please, your method of reporting the collection and preparation of leaves extract is kindly not coherent and has a lot of grammatical errors and therefore cannot be followed.</p> <p>The tables you have suggested are not coherent with this work. They are unnecessarily ambiguous. The results are in precise form. Thank you.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	