SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_26902**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ENHANCEMENT OF GROWTH AND YIELD PERFORMANCE IN TOMATO (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill) THROUGH FOLIAR APPLICATION OF A NUTRIENT SUPPLEMENT**
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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The writing of the manuscript is good **Abstract:** -Start the abstract with one line about the importance of supplement nutrient and its use on tomato that clearly depicts the aim of your experiment. -Author did not mention, at how many old days' plants, foliar treatments were applied and after how many days of foliar application, data was recorded. -Do not mention site (location) of experiment in Abstract. Remove Line 11-14 (Variety was allotted…….. Least Significant Difference (LSD)). -Describe the detail experimental design in Materials and Methods part instead of writing it in Abstract. **Introduction:** -Write Solanaceae instead of *solanaceae.* -Write µm instead of um. -Write CO_2 instead of CO2. The objective is missing at the end of introduction that will helps in understanding the need of this work. Write aim of the work in clear words (1-2 lines). - References from the recent years should be used. **Material and Methods:** -Write 0.5m × 0.5m and 1.0m × 2.0m instead of using word 'by'. -Data tables showed that Author have collected data four times with two weeks interval right after two weeks of transplanting but Author did not mention it in his plan of work **-Concern,**	

	-Soil analysis of experimental site did not show the concentration of Calcium that can help us in determining either soil was deficit of calcium or not. **Results and Discussion** -Results and Discussion part is mainly covered with the results and discussion part need more work and modifications. References are missed from literature that can justify findings of this experiment. Author did not mention Tables in Result part. -The data presented in Tables should be mentioned as Means ± SE and should also mention the significance of each. -Draw the tables presenting data in split plot design that clearly show significant means of main plots as well as sub plots and their interactions **Conclusion** -Conclusion is mentioned in clear and proper way with recommendations. **References** -Author did not follow the style of AJEA. -References are not in proper style. - References from the recent years should be used.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I would recommend the authors to update the manuscript, follow the format of AJEA, correct it to be more precise	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Nazimah Maqbool***
Department, University & Country	***Botany, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan***