

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_114494
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bio-stimulants on growth, yield, quality and biotic resistance in Chilli (Capsicum annum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.- Yes, it is important, but need to improve</p> <p>2.- Yes</p> <p>3.- Yes, but very poor, need to add one line of discussion and conclusion</p> <p>4.- The structure is appropriate, but the content need to improve</p> <p>5.- Their done an experiment and indicate the result, the discussion, but without a correct way to explain why this research is important, how they come up to this, the importance of the results. It not only about how a product that can increase the size of the chilli, what happen at a cellular point of view, how this amino-acid helps the growth of the chilli, why vitamin C is increased, etc</p> <p>6.- No the reference are not suficient, they need more reference to explain the introduction, why is important this research, to explain the methodology used and to improve the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1.- Need to improve</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After the review, it can be seen that the topic is interesting, but there is a need to increase the robustness of the article. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Further bibliographical review is necessary, -The working methodology is poorly explained, as are the statistical methods used. Adding a map for better understanding of the area, and planting site will be excelent -The discussion of the results could be improved by comparing with previous or similar studies, at this point no reference is used. At the same time, it is necessary to explain some abbreviations and place the units corresponding to some measurements. The discussion of results is very poor, as is the conclusion. -improve the writing in English 	

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:	Aracelis Narayan Rajnauth
Department, University & Country	Portugal