Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_42549**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Identification of lines of tomato resistant to bacterial wilt**
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 manuscript **"Identification of lines of tomato resistant to bacterial wilt"** focuses on the suitable lines resistant to the bacterial wilt disease. This manuscript has to make major corrections before it to publish in "**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**" journal. The followings are the major comments on the paper. Abstract: Reframe the sentences "Phytobacteriology Laboratory …… September 2016" and "The evaluation ……resistance components". Line 8: "fhenotypic" change as phenotyoic. Line 17: Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum – should be italic **Introduction:** ➢ Need not to explain every time the scientific name of the pathogen. Give first time full name and then follow the short form (Ex: *R. solanacearum*) to throughout the manuscript. ➢ *Solanum lycopersicon* L or *Solanum lycopersicum* L which one is correct? Follow the correct one. ➢ *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* – Both are same or different. Use the correct one and write throughout the paper. ➢ Always scientific name should be in italic form. Follow this to the manuscript. **Materials and methods** ➢ Avoid the word "isolated" and use "isolates" throughout the paper. ➢ How many plants are maintained per treatment? ➢ What is the reason for using three isolates of *R. solanacearum* for screening? **Result and Discussion** The result explanation is too lengthy and it's difficult to read and understand. It should be reduced and rewrite as simple as possible with recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments	----	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript should make necessary corrections based on the above said comments before to get publish. Introduction and Materials and methods are well written. But other sections should be improved. Hence I recommend the manuscript to publish after the major	

	revision.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Prabhukarthikeyan***
Department, University & Country	***ICAR-National Rice Research Institute, India***