

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_100753</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Recent Advances in Crop Improvement of Chilli (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) for Fruit Yield and Quality</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It would help researchers on Chili and Chili breeders to understand the relevant progress.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Recent Advances in Crop Improvement of Chilli (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) for High Fruit Yield and Quality</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract of this article is comprehensive.</b></li> <li>4. <b>the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></li> <li>5. <b>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	There were some spelling mistakes and grammatical mistakes, please read through the manuscript and made revisions as the revision examples.	
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Xianmei YU</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shandong Institute of Pomology, China</b>