

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_100092
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of two varieties of tomato Solanum lycopersicum L as affected by two concentration of hydroponic solution
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:

(<https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	  1. Yes, this research is important because of the subject it deals with and the solution of agricultural and socioeconomic technical problems.  2. Yes, if the title for the article is appropriate.  3. It is recommended that the data of the treatments applied and the concentrations of nutrients used be placed more precisely, among other data that make the work carried out more attractive, complete and at the same time synthetic. 4. Yes, the subsections of the scientific article are adequate  5. I do believe that the article is scientifically well structured.  6. It is advisable to add at least 10 more bibliographical references and, above all, more up-to-date ones, from more recent years.  7. I recommend putting the most direct conclusions to respond to the research objectives and avoid speaking and giving an opinion on aspects that are not covered in the research. The concentrations and nutrients that are in the fertilization formula must be correctly determined.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I do consider adequate the quality of the language used in the writing of the scientific article	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Horacio Villalon-Mendoza
Department, University & Country	Mexico