

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_128882
Title of the Manuscript:	Resistance degree of two hot pepper hybrids to pests in organic farming
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of sustainable agriculture and pest management. It provides valuable insights into the comparative resistance of hot pepper hybrids to pests under organic farming conditions, highlighting the role of genetic traits and cultivation practices in enhancing resilience. The findings underscore the potential of selecting pest-resistant hybrids to reduce reliance on chemical pesticides, aligning with global efforts toward eco-friendly and sustainable farming. Additionally, the study contributes to the understanding of practical organic farming strategies, offering a framework for future research and application in diverse agricultural settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Resistance degree of two hot pepper hybrids to pests in organic farming," is clear and descriptive, but it could be improved for better engagement and specificity: Comparative Pest Resistance of Hot Pepper Hybrids in Organic Farming Systems	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract could benefit from specific details about the methods, such as the hybrids studied or the conditions under which the research was conducted. Additionally, results and quantitative outcomes (e.g., yield differences, pest resistance percentages) are absent, leaving the reader without a clear sense of the study's findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Introduction While informative, the introduction is lengthy and includes some repetitive information. For instance, the description of pest resistance mechanisms and environmental benefits could be streamlined. Furthermore, the objectives of the study should be more explicitly stated.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Table 1 could include a column summarizing the expected effects of the listed fertilizers for better context. The rationale for specific bio-insecticide applications (Table 2) is not well-explained. For example, why were certain bio-insecticides chosen over others? The description of meteorological conditions is detailed but lacks integration into the methodology (e.g., how this data informs the study's findings). A control group or comparison to conventional farming practices is missing, limiting the ability to attribute results solely to organic methods.</p> <p>Results and Discussion Statistical analysis is not explicitly mentioned. For instance, were differences in yield or pest resistance between hybrids statistically significant? Table 6 suggests variations in pest attacks, but the discussion does not delve into why Hungarian peppers were more vulnerable beyond basic observations. The discussion could better connect findings to broader implications for organic farming practices and</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>pest management strategies. The economic analysis of using resistant hybrids versus conventional varieties would enhance the practical relevance of the study.</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusion is generic and lacks actionable recommendations based on the study's findings. For instance, how might the results guide the selection of hybrids or bio-insecticides for other regions? The economic and ecological trade-offs of organic versus conventional methods are not addressed.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are a mix of relevant and foundational studies, but some are relatively dated, such as those from 2000 and 2007. While they provide a solid background, the inclusion of more recent studies (post-2020) would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and alignment with the latest advancements in the field.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Studies on recent advancements in organic pest management techniques or biocontrol methods. Example: "Advances in biological pest control in sustainable agriculture" (recent journal articles focusing on organic solutions). 2. Research on the genetic basis of pest resistance in peppers or other crops: Example: New studies exploring the molecular mechanisms of pest resistance in Capsicum species. 3. Updated works on the impact of climate factors on pest dynamics and organic farming: Example: Studies from journals such as <i>Agronomy</i> or <i>Sustainability</i> that discuss climate effects on pest outbreaks. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally clear and conveys the research effectively, but it has room for improvement to meet the highest standards of scholarly communication. Specifically:</p> <p>A thorough language edits or proofreading by another person or a professional editing service specializing in academic writing is recommended. This would refine the manuscript's readability and ensure it meets the high standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the information provided in the manuscript, there do not appear to be overt ethical issues.</p>	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<p><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Frank Yeboah Adusei
Department, University & Country	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, United States