



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Good paper that could be considered for publication by JSRR. However, more needs to be done to bring the paper up to publication standard.</p> <p>First and foremost, the paper has been poorly articulated in several sections. Even the abstract is barely comprehensible. This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Secondly, more related papers should be sourced for and cited at the level of the introduction to give it more weight.</p> <p>Equally, the methodology section should be subdivided into sections as follows: area of study, data collection procedure; and data analysis procedure. And the statistical software used for data analysis should be highlighted in the data analysis section.</p> <p>Also, the results section of the study should be subdivided into sub-sections following the specific objectives of the paper in order to give the findings more coherence.</p> <p>Last but not the least, the paper's findings should be discussed properly. The author(s) of the paper need to compare and contrast the findings of the paper with the findings of other authors who have conducted related studies in other parts of the world. Thus, the most recent scientific publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain should be sought for and used to discuss the findings of the paper.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	More authors should be sourced for and used in the study to give it more depth.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good paper that could be considered for publication. However, the afore-cited comments and evaluations should be taken into account before the paper is considered for publication.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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><i>Nyong Princely Awazi</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Dschang, Cameroon</i></b>