



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50114
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization and Diversity of Peppers ( <i>Capsicum</i> spp.) Genotypes Based on Morphological Traits Using Multivariate Analysis
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>The manuscript entitled, "Characterization and Diversity of Peppers (<i>Capsicum</i> spp.) Genotypes Based on Morphological Traits Using Multivariate Analysis."</p> <p>General: The manuscript entitled, "Characterization and Diversity of Peppers (<i>Capsicum</i> spp.) Genotypes Based on Morphological Traits Using Multivariate Analysis." is an important piece of work describing the characterization and genetic diversity of Peppers. Importantly the authors have done excellent efforts. The literature review is thorough. Tables were presented properly. I approve of it for publication after following minor revision in the manuscript as below.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Separate Results and Discussion</li> <li>2. Follow reference pattern according to Journal.</li> <li>3. Arrange keywords alphabetically.</li> </ol>	<p>Thanks for the suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We believe that by separating the results of the discussions can make the reader's reading process a bit more confusing, since the biplot GT analysis requires that the reader go back to the graphs for better understanding at all time during the reading. Based on other experiences with this type of article, we believe that it will facilitate the process of understanding. But, if it is necessary to separate the results and discussions, we will do so in a future suggestion.</li> <li>2. We revised all the references and made adjustments when necessary.</li> <li>3. Corrections made.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	