

## Review Form 2

Book Name:	<a href="#">Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3734
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of extracts from plant leaves as edible coatings on quality retention of tomato ( <i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) fruits during storage after artificial inoculation with fungal isolates
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

### General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This Book'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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/book-benefits-for-reviewers>

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The edible coatings provide better price to farmers. It gives improved shelf life to crops.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>Yes</u>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<u>Yes</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>Please provide the intricate methods of tomatoes Coating.</u>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<u>Practical methods of tomato coatings are missing in the manuscript. Moreover no experiments is designed to feel the suitability of Tomato coatings. Please give proper experimental setup for tomato coatings. At least provide the Vanity van kind of methods for coatings.</u>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<u>Updated references are not sufficient.</u>	

[Review Form 2](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sandeep Bhardwaj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CCS Haryana Agricultural University, India</b>