

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_111594
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF LOW TUNNEL HEIGHTS AND IRRIGATION REGIMES ON GROWTH PARAMETERS OF CAPSICUM
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Manuscript shows importance for scientific community as stated in its introductory section.</p> <p>2. Title is concise and suitable for the manuscript presented.</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive though may I suggest to include the time and location of the study in this section.</p> <p>4. For the introduction, it is suggested that the time and location should be specified and be highlighted. I assume that the treatments tested (low tunnel heights and drip irrigation) indicates adaptation practices that may be required on a specific location/region where the study was conducted.</p> <p>Is there a local climate situation in the region that calls for the use of these innovations? If there is, then it would be a good justification to enhance the value of the research and suggested to be included in the introduction.</p> <p>Moreover, in the results and discussion part, it is observed that the author had only describe the data results and lacks "comprehensive discussion" explaining why the observation happened and how the treatments affected such parameters. These should be supported by previous literatures detailing why such results happened in the experimental set up.</p> <p>5. Manuscript shows scientifically correct claims. However, it is suggested to further enhance discussion of results as stated in Comment 4, otherwise the manuscript is scientifically sound and correct.</p> <p>6. References stated in the introductory part were found sufficient and recent enough. These references could also be re-stated upon enhancement of the results discussion by the authors.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>7. Manuscript displays scholarly good communication writing proficiency in English language.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Bryan Glomel S. Silverio
Department, University & Country	Center for High Value Crops, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Philippines