



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46600
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed Quality Responses of Two Chilli Pepper Varieties (Capsicum frutescens L.) to Different Planting Dates
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>Good Introduction What is the fundamental reason for using Randomized complete block design? May be you can use another design!!!! It could be interesting to explain why you prefer this design!</p> <p>It's could be interesting to locate <u>Experimental Location</u> in the map!</p> <p>Paragraphs <u>Nursery management</u> and <u>Preparation of experimental field and crop husbandry practices</u>. Where did you found the methodology ? From literature? Please indicate an author</p> <p>Very interesting result, but the discussion must be documented</p>	<p>In basic biometry, experiments where we anticipated huge variation (edaphic, rainfall, temperature and relative humidity) we block so that experimental errors could be minimized. The design for such studies is RCBD. The study area could be exposed to many variations which could adversely affect validity and accuracy of data and results.</p> <p>We have difficulty downloading the map online for the study area. Please remember we provided the latitudes and longitudes for easy identification</p> <p>Not from literature. Detailed description of materials and methods is recommended in scientific writing so that similar work could be reproduced anywhere, anytime. There were no authors, we gave our on description.</p> <p>Documentation of discussion is relevant. Our results were compared to findings in existing literature.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>No working in this topic on 2016? 2017? 2018? Please the discussion could be documented by some recently references</p>	<p>There are lot of agronomic works on pepper but not on seed quality parameters especially in connection with planting dates. The available references are what we used in this study.</p>
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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	