Review Form 2

	Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
	Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3734
	Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of extracts from plant leaves as edible coatings on quality retention of tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.) fruits of with fungal isolates
	Type of the Article	Book Chapter

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This Book's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/</u> Benefits for Reviewers: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/book-benefits-for-reviewers</u>

PART 1: Review Comments

Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (I part in the manuscript. his/her feedback here)
The article is of scientific importance as it addresses a very serious and vital issue of food storage elongation through application of edible coating made up of native plants extracts. Such coatings are useful in terms of financial and technical aspects because of having fewer side effects/drawbacks on consumer health and product quality.	
No, I think title of the article should be revised. Revised title may be as follows: - "Edible Coatings from Plant Leaf Extracts: Preserving Quality and Mitigating Fungal Contamination in Stored Tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.) Fruits"	
No, abstract needs thorough revisions. It needs to be concised. More quantitative results should be incorporated in it. Write importance of the title study in it. Write significant findings in an attractive and understandable way.	
Yes, subsections are appropriate upto a certain extent but overall not properly formatted and characterized.	
I think the article is poorly written in scientific language. Overall quality of article language is very poor and it has not been justified with the tables either. There are no figures to exemplify the findings of the study. In tables, statistical analysis are not well-performed and written. Results and discussion section is not written scientifically and recommendations must not be stated under separate heading instead these should be mentioned in conclusion.Number of references and their recency is not sufficient as most of the references are outdated. So, ths section also needs a complete revision.	
	The article is of scientific importance as it addresses a very serious and vital issue of food storage elongation through application of edible coating made up of native plants extracts. Such coatings are useful in terms of financial and technical aspects because of having fewer side effects/drawbacks on consumer health and product quality. No, I think title of the article should be revised. Revised title may be as follows: - "Edible Coatings from Plant Leaf Extracts: Preserving Quality and Mitigating Fungal Contamination in Stored Tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.) Fruits" No, abstract needs thorough revisions. It needs to be concised. More quantitative results should be incorporated in it. Write significant findings in an attractive and understandable way. Yes, subsections are appropriate upto a certain extent but overall not properly formatted and characterized. I think the article is poorly written in scientific language. Overall quality of article language is very poor and it has not been justified with the tables either. There are no figures to exemplify the findings of the study. In tables, statistical analysis are not well-performed and written. Results and discussion section is not written scientifically and recommendations must not be stated under separate heading instead these should be mentioned in conclusion. Number of references and their recency is not sufficient as most of the references are outdated.

s during storage after artificial inoculation

(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that ipt. It is mandatory that authors should write re)

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments	No, the language of the manuscript is poor and is not fit for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed highlight that part in the manus his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tauqeer Ahmad
Department, University & Country	Agriculuture Instituite, Pakistan

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and uscript. It is mandatory that authors should write