

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_103201
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of 2,4-D on growth and yield of Chilli (Capsicum annum L.)
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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The basic idea behind this piece is sound, but the presentation is terrible.</p> <p>Your introduction was written effortlessly and lacked references.</p> <p>Your text's references were introduced with the number [6] and were presented in two styles. In the results section, the author listed all the titles and their findings but did not explain each data separately.</p> <p>Besides, the results and discussion section started with the statistical analysis results that were not mentioned in the materials and methods section.</p> <p>What statistical software was used in this study? Please utilize statistical analysis to support anything you've said. The presentation is so poor, and the language is a jumble of weak sentences. There are several verbs and sentences that have been repeated more than once. Besides that, the discussion section was a total mess (meaningless).</p> <p>Your conclusion paragraph was written without any effortlessly. I couldn't find any organization or detailed explanation were a shambles.</p> <p>The earliest references were also utilized in this manuscript to validate the authors' observations and points of view. The list of references is insufficient and out-of-date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Egypt