SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_AJEA_5927**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Reproducible *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of Nigerian cultivars of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum L.)***
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	I have read carefuly the manuscript **Reproducible *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of Nigerian cultivars of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum L.)*** with code 20013_AJEA_5927. My opinion is this manuscript is well planned and the Material and Method is neat and complete. My expectations was very favorable until got the section Results and Discussion. First this part of the article in general is the most important insomuch as this section shows the preparation and the authors' level; this section has to be very cared. When a journal propose the possibility to show Result and Discussion together, that mean the authors have to show one result and discuss this result, then show another result and discuss this other results and so on, results and discussion are mixed in the section. In the current manuscript I found one paragraph corresponding to the results exposed as a telegraph and a separated paragraph corresponding to the very very short discussion. This give an impression like the authors have weakened. My opinion is this manuscript is still	

	uncompleted, it looks a very good research and the paper has to reflect the effort and time invest in this investigation and it is essential a Result and Discussion section well outlined and argued. This manuscript should be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dr. Eva Arrebola Diez**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Mycology, Institute of Subtropical and Mediterranean Hortofruticulture (IHSM-UMA-CSIC). Spain**