

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 in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	TOPIC Authors performed crosses between two tomato parents while progenies produced were used for the experiment. Moreover, the experiment was conducted in greenhouse. In this respect, alternative title like “Assessment of resistance status of tomato progenies to <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> using analysis of GGE Biplot and REML/BLUP” may also be applicable. ABSTRACT Instead of “The bacterial wilt caused by <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacerum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacerum</i> is among the pathogenic bacteria responsible for reduced productivity of tomato breeding in Brazil.” Can also be read as “The bacterial wilt caused by <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacerum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacerum</i>, is among the bacterial diseases responsible for tomato fruit yields reduction in Brazil.” What do these CCRMRS 74 and CCRMRS 185 mean? Do the authors mean 74 and 185 isolates of each type respectively or should be written as CCRMRS-74 and CCRMRS-185? Note the hyphens. Please crosscheck. “The evaluations were performed by employing the data of the days 10 and 20 after inoculation.” Recast this statement. It is not clear enough. Authors need to insert some significant results of incidence and severity in the abstract. Note: “There was agreement between the GGE biplot and REML/BLUP methods in the identification of genotypes resistant to <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i>. There was agreement between the GGE biplot and the REML/BLUP methods in identification of genotypes resistant to <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i>.” Repetition of statement. Delete one. INTRODUCTION In line 16, “Considered the causal agents of bacterial wilt in Brazil.....tomato breeding”. Can simply be put as “Bacterial wilt disease caused by <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i>, has been a major problem of tomato production in Brazil”. Can authors provide the current tomato production indices in Brazil? Recast the objective (Line 51 and 52). MATERIALS AND METHODS This section should be written as “MATERIALS AND METHODS” AND NOT “MATERIAL AND METHODS” (Line 54). Note the red colored words. Line 56 to 59, can also be considered as “Crosses were made between the Yoshimatsu and IPA-7 genitors. Thirty-four (34) genotypes of the F₁ and F₂ population obtained were used for the assessment of resistance status to <i>R. Pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>R. solanacearum</i> species, using the CCRMRS-74 and CCRMRS-185 isolates, respectively.” Once again, crosscheck the proper way of writing these; CCRMRS 74 and CCRMRS 185. (Line 58 and 59). Where is/are the source(s) of these isolates? Line 61 and 62, better this way “.....Department of Agronomy, <i>Universidade</i>.....” In line 63 to 65, “....from 9/28 to 11/26..... 10/26 to 12/12....” The meanings of these fractions are not clear. Can authors write them in a more comprehensive way? In line 69, authors wrote “Three seeds per cell were used.” USED FOR WHAT? Make this clear. To irrigate experimental plants when needed is not scientific; regular irrigation should operate. (Line 70 and 71). Line 76 and 77, what does it mean by (5x10⁸ UFC ml⁻¹). The correct way is (5x10⁸ CFU ml⁻¹). Also, “....were placed in it.” Simply put as “was used for inoculation.” Recast, line 83 and 84 to make it clearer. Also, “..... a water conserving means” is not clear. Line 87 and 88 “.....adjusted for the concentration of (5x10⁸ UFC ml⁻¹)....” Can be put as “..... adjusted to 5x10⁸ CFU ml⁻¹.”	AUTHOR'S ANSWER TOPIC: the title option was accepted. ABSTRACT: all the suggestion was accepted. INTRODUCTION: Line 16: the phrase was modified. Line 51 and 52: the objective was modified. MATERIALS AND METHODS: Line 54: the word was modified. Line 56 to 59: the phrase was modified. Line 58 and 59: Information was added. Line 61 and 62: the phrase was modified. Line 63 to 65: the meanings were written. Line 69: the phrase was modified. Line 70 and 71: the information was removed. Line 76 and 77: the acronym and the phrase were corrected. Line 83 and 84: the phrase was modified Line 87 and 88: the phrase was modified. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Line 93 and 94: the scale has been corrected and the reference added. Line 123 and 124: the phrase was modified. Table 1: The acronym and caption were added. Figure 1, 2 and 3: The caption was modified to “days after inoculation with...” Aboute the authors not citing previous studies for a discussion succinctly: We did not find work done using the new botanic classifications of the bacteriawhere they are separated by species. The researchs do not study the <i>Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum</i> and <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> separately in the same article. But we added some discussions.

	In line 93 and 94,“....1 = dead plants; 2 = completely wilted plants; 3 = plants with up to two-thirds of wilted leaves; 4 = plants with up to one-third of wilted leaves; and 5 = lack of symptoms.” Are you the first to use this type of scale? The least scale carries the highest severity while the maximum scale carries the lowest severity. This is strange! How was the disease incidence calculated? Authors need to address this. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION In line 123 and 124 “...thus, the classifications of the tomato genotypes can be altered in accordance to the bacterium taken into consideration.” The statement is not clear. In Table 1, legend of abbreviations very necessary. Still, 10 Days, 20 Days be written as 10 DAI, where DAI: days after inoculation. This should be explained in the legend accordingly. Figure 1, 2 and 3 legends need to be written succinctly. What do these mean? That is10⁰ day and 20⁰ day. These are not clear. Are they technical way of writing some terms, authors need to make these clear? Authors presented their results but discussion of their findings has not been succinctly addressed. Discussion should point out the importance of the results and to place them in the context of previous studies.	
Minor REVISION comments	It is quite clear that the experiment was replicated four times. Did the authors repeat the work? How many times?	
Optional/General comments		