Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAERI_87923**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of substrate on germination and fruiting of tomatoes**
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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract.** Authors are encouraged to use the format: Aims, Materials and methods, Results, Conclusion. **Introduction**. The work is being presented as an original research article. In my opinion, it seems more like a review, the introduction is too long. It is recommended that at the end of the introduction the objective of the research is written. **Materials and Methods.** This section must be described extensively (it is not valid to mention that the temperature and humidity were in optimal conditions). Please include: experimental design, number of experimental units, repetitions, each and every one of the operations carried out from the preparation of the substrate in the trays, monitoring, irrigation, etc. On the other hand, include under what methodology the experiment was carried out, in addition to describing each of the study variables or response variables. Finally, mention how the results were analyzed. **Results and discussion.** In this section, I consider that the way in which the results are presented is not adequate: 1. There are no tables or graphs showing the operating conditions. 2. When the authors mention the term marketable, the reader may not know what they mean. It is suggested that the criteria that consider or describe marketable or non-marketable be placed. 3. There is no statistical analysis to define which treatment was most appropriate. 4. There is no timeline from sowing, germination, growth, flowering, fruiting, harvest and yield. 5. There is no discussion. **Conclusion**. The conclusions must be written clearly, firstly, conclude based on the objective of the investigation, later with the most outstanding results. In addition, a conclusion could be included where the contribution to knowledge is reflected. **References**. Please review the format of the journal's references, and adjust each and every one to that format.	
Minor REVISION comments	In the document in full there are some observations not considered in this evaluation format.	
Optional/General comments	Personally, I consider the work to be interesting, however, a careful review of the observations and making the pertinent changes is required. I believe that the authors have the necessary elements to make the adjustments and that the work meets the quality characteristics that the journal requires. Finally, it is necessary that the work be reviewed again for its possible acceptance.	

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 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lucio González Montiel**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad de la Cañada, México**