



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_49049
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of bio-fungicides on seed quality parameters and disease control in chilli seeds infected with Colletotrichum capsici
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The most suitable experimental design for obtaining information and knowledge is a factorial experiment. The interaction between the nine treatments and the two approaches used (blotter and pot) may produce interesting results with regard to future experimental designs. The Tukey Multiple Comparison test is the most suitable for comparisons between means. The use of letters in the tables to show the statistical significance of the differences would make the written text clearer. In table 1 the CV of the first column is strangely low and recommends a conference in the data of the other columns. (I only analyzed the data in this column).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since the two experiments were of different conditions, that is blotter and pot culture, the factorial design was not followed. - alphabets in the tables are incorporated to show the statistically significant differences between the treatments. - CV values are verified again, but found the same.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues