

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_96347
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of agronomic performance and nutraceutical quality fruits of four genotypes of bell pepper under greenhouse
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The topic "Evaluation of agronomic performance and nutraceutical quality fruits of four genotypes of bell pepper under greenhouse" is an interesting and novelty moderate of study in the field. However, before accepting for publication, some point of manuscript needs to revise and make it clear for correct understanding.</p> <p>The results in the present work is believable based on the strong scientific knowledge. However, one point of the study needs to clarify by authors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the results and topic, it seems the experiment dose not promote in term of nutraceutical? May need to modify the main topic or increase some related experiment in the manuscript. 2. All figures need to increase the resolution. 3. Please revise the determination of antioxidant activity. Also, check all point in the whole manuscript. 4. In the conclusion seems to be in general and is not given separately, it is highly recommended to include limitation of the study and potential future research goals. 5. What is the main point of this study? How the agronomic performance of fruit relates to genotypes of pepper plant under the greenhouse condition. Justify. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>none</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>none</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Utthapon Issara
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand