



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_49179
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of lettuce in consortium with carrot in agroecological production of Brazil
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:

(<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	<p>Line 10. as alternative interesting for small for producers with</p> <p>Lines 12-14. The experiment was conducted in between the months of August to November of 2012 in the municipality of Garanhuns-PE/Brazil. It Hhad as...</p> <p>Line 24. Put keywords alphabetically!</p> <p>Globally, according to the guidelines of the journal, the names of the authors in the text must be coded in numeral (ex. [1]) in the text and their correspondence written in the references. Theses references should be coded in order of appearance in the text. Authors have to read author's guidelines and MS word SDI paper template.</p> <p>Line 31. preparation, its belongs to the Asteraceae family (FILGUEIRA, 2003) [1].</p> <p>Line 32. Oleracea ???</p> <p>Line 37. are productive and adapted to the summer crop (VIEIRA et al., 1999) [2]. (Ditto for the rest of authors).</p> <p>Line 52. However for many researchers, it is a primitive...</p> <p>Lines 69-70. 4m 4 m of length by 1m 1 m wide and 20cm 20 cm high.</p> <p>Lines 71-72. It was not nNo chemical input was used in the experiment.</p> <p>Line 76. Cultivate cultivar?</p> <p>Line 85. So he alternately planted ???</p> <p>Line 97. of the them in to the sun</p> <p>Lines 107-108. The performance of the carrot was Nnot evaluated, because there was no control (bed with single carrot) for comparisons</p> <p>Lines 122-123. Reformulate!</p> <p>Line 124. Who which</p> <p>Line 129. this difference is was observed</p> <p>Line 131. Although, ...</p> <p>Lines 137-141, 149-151, 172-174.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tabela 1. Table 1. - Figure 1. Fig. 1. Figure 2. Fig. 2. - The titles of the tables and figures as well as the first line of the tables must be in bold. - Legends or Footnotes should be write with superscript lowercase letters (inclined/italicized) <p>Lines 120-174. The discussion is almost nonexistent</p> <p>Lines 177-182. The conclusion is light and without prospects</p> <p>Lines 184-207.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [1] - References are poorly written. Authors have to read author's guidelines and MS word SDI paper template. - Some references used are very old. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This article is not well written. Guidelines for the article presentation of the journal and MS word SDI paper template must be taken into account by the authors. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for major revision.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Temegne Nono</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon</i>