

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39411
Title of the Manuscript:	Differentiation of Resistance to Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum and Ralstonia solanacearum in Tomato Genotypes via Analysis of GGE Biplot and REML/BLUP
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 of the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This research topic is relevant. However many sentences are difficult to understand and their grammatical arrangement should be improved. There are some things compulsory to be revised: 1. The consistency of writing the scientific name of bacteria, sometimes <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>, sometimes <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacerum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacerum</i>. Please write the right name and always keep same. 2. In introduction part, line 20: the sentence “this cultivation” refers to what, is it to tomato or tobacco and potato? Make the correct and clear sentence. 3. In introduction part, line 32: I think in this topic the terms of adaptability is not needed, you must change it with a relevant statement in accordance with the objective and discussion of this research. 4. In material and methods part: organize in sequence how this research is done and what materials are used. 5. In material and methods part, 2.2 part: a sentence in line 98-100 it needs reference(s). Formulas in line 100 and 108, do not make it include in sentence but put it below so clearly see. 6. In results and discussion part: the discussion is still lacking, it only describes the result from table and graph. For example, line 182-185 and 191-196 there is no discussion compares or aligns with the study of others already done, so that will enrich the study and reference. 7. Line 221-223: the results are based on what? 8. In conclusion part: why genotypes 5, 11 and 43 did not mention in conclusion? because in line 193 and 225 it mentions as most wanted and good genotypes. 9. In references part: some references listed the year of publication are not written down. The consistency of the bibliography literature format. Please check and correct it.	AUTHOR'S ANSWER 1. The study was based on the new classification of <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>. In this, the pathogen was divided into three species, being <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>, used in this study, and <i>Ralstonia syzygii</i>. 2. It was corrected. 3. The phrase was modified 4. Some modifications were made in the Materials and Methods and was added a table with the cultivars used. 5. The reference was added and the formulas were placed in another paragraph. 6. We did not find work done using the new botanic classifications of the bacteria where they are separated by species. The researches do not study the <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> separately in the same article But we added some discussions. 7. The results are based on the level of resistance presented by each genotype. Where the toughest are in the best rankings. 8. In the conclusion are only the genotypes selected, simultaneously, by the two methods. 9. The references have been corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	1. In keywords part, abstract part: first keyword is <i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>, from the whole of manuscript there is no mention this word, author just mention tomato without the scientific name, replace it into “tomato” or add “<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>” in title or introduction if you still want to use, as well as other keywords please adjust. For example, you can use “gge biplot”, “reml/blup”, etc. 2. In introduction part: First and second paragraph can join, it is too short as a paragraph. 3. Line 169: is that true the acronym is AEV? 4. In conclusion part: make it become a paragraph.	1. The keywords have been corrected. 2. The paragraphs were corrected 3. The acronym has been corrected 4. The paragraphs were corrected
Optional/General comments	Acceptable with that revision	