



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAHR_45808</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of three ash-based storage media on the physical quality characteristics and shelf life of three cultivars of tomato (<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>, Mill) grown in the greenhouse</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Paper</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Last line on the abstract, please, indicates the extended shelf-life. From? to?</li> <li>- Are there some works on this (ash-based storage media)?... please, briefly referenciate in your INTRODUCTION.</li> <li>- Talk more about or discuss the results on 3.1. (for example: Are these temperature and relative humidity expected? They have influenced on the effect of ash-based...?) and these results are missing in the abstract.</li> <li>- Be consistent on your statistic probability. Is it <math>p &lt; 0.01</math>? or <math>p \leq 0.01</math>?</li> <li>- Include, in the MATERIAL AND METHODS, how did you assess? Fruit firmness, Pericarp thickness, Moisture content, Postharvest decay and Shelf life.</li> </ul>	<p>Correction made in revised manuscript.</p> <p>We are justifying why being a waste product ash could be used as media for storage since its environmentally safe and friendly.</p> <p>This was to give an idea of the storage conditions which probably could have influenced the behaviour of the stored tomato fruits. In our discussion temperature and humidity were not implicated in any of the measured parameters.</p> <p>Corrections are made in the manuscript. We used <math>p \leq 0.01</math></p> <p>Corrections are made in the manuscript</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Move the phrases from line 32 to 37 to make smart the INDRODUCTION.</p> <p>Delete the phrase on line 69.</p>	<p>Corrections are made in the manuscript</p> <p>Corrections are made in the manuscript</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Give space between line 88 and 89.</li> <li>- Format table 2 in order to fit in the window.</li> <li>- Table 3 to table 7 doesn't make sense on putting the column and line of mean. Delete it (each ash-based and cultivar are completely different).</li> <li>- Be consistent on the references. Example: Some journal names are written in italic and others NO. Other article titles are written with capital letters others NO. Separation by COMMA and others by COLON.</li> </ul>	<p>Table formatted as suggested.</p> <p>Please note that this is a standard interaction table. Those means are for the individual effects (cultivar alone and ash alone respectively as interpreted in the manuscript. Statistically we focus on the interaction first (being the ultimate goal of our study) and then the individual effects (means of ash and variety if necessary. Deleting will make the table incomplete please.</p> <p>Corrections done in the manuscript</p>

**PART 2:**

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