

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_114464</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of local types of bird's eye chilli (<i>Capsicum frutescens</i> L.) for plant and fruit morphological characters.</b>
Type of the 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><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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community. This study provides information on the character comparison of several local types of <i>C. frutescens</i>, where these chili types do not necessarily exist in other regions.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title is suitable for the article</b></li> <li>3. <b>Still need additional information in the abstract in the form of the meaning of the C.V. that has been displayed in the results section.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but the content still needs to be improvised (see comments in the manuscript).</b></li> <li>5. <b>There are several parts (contents) in the manuscript that need to be clarified, including the use of two replicates in the experimental design, which is generally a minimum of three replicates (see manuscript for other comments).</b></li> <li>6. <b>Still dominated by references published more than five years ago. In addition, web-based references such as Wikipedia and blogs were found, preferably using journal articles.</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>	The language/English quality of the article is sufficiently appropriate for scientific communication	
<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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Asmar Hasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Halu Oleo University, Indonesia</b>