

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3735
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal effect of extracts of plant leaves on postharvest decay and quality of tomato fruits during storage
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 manuscript addresses a novel topic as it addresses variants for the management of post-harvest fungal diseases using plant extracts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is in line with the stated objectives	
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.	The abstract is correctly prepared. I suggest changing the keywords for others that are not reflected in the title to improve search capacity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The characteristics of the fungal strains evaluated do not appear in the body of the document. Only their name is reflected in the results; however, it should appear in the Materials and Methods section with details of their origin (source, where they were isolated from, molecular identification if applicable). As for the determinations of the effect of the extracts on the fruits, they are not described, nor are there even bibliographies referring to how these determinations are made. The statistical analysis used is not described. There is repeated information in the text and tables.	
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.	There is little discussion of the results. The relationship between the determinations made is not clear. I suggest relating the results of the protective activity of the extracts and the determined phytochemical composition, which would justify the operational course followed in the research. It refers in materials and methods to the determination of variables whose results do not appear (shelf life).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are used correctly, however only 1 (5%) is from the last 10 years. I suggest updating the bibliography consulted. I also suggest increasing those related to the discussion of the achieved results.	

[Review Form 2](#)

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The document makes some observations, but in general it is correctly written.	
Optional/General comments	The document reflects a clear problem and addresses novel aspects of great scientific interest. However, it is necessary to provide more information that is not clear in the experimental progress, as well as to increase the discussion of the results, emphasizing their interrelation.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mileidy De La Cruz Martin
Department, University & Country	Instituto De Biotecnologia De las Plantas, Cuba