



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_64079
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIAL ASSESSMENT AND PROXIMATE COMPOSTION OF PEPPER (CAPSICUM ANNUM) AND TOMATO (SOLANUM LYCOPERSICUM) SOLD IN THE MARKET
Type of the Article	

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keywords are missing in <b>abstract</b>.</li> <li>In <b>introduction</b> there are three references- (Singh, 2013); (Singh and Sharma, 2007) and Sapers' <i>et al.</i>, (2001) which are missing in the references section below. Furthermore, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> para should have the References.</li> <li>In <b>material and method</b>, sub-heading <b>isolation of microorganisms</b> should have a reference that whose method was followed or who described the method and similar in <b>Examination of fungi</b>. Furthermore, sub-heading <b>Examination of bacteria</b> contains a reference (Cheesebrough, 2000) which is missing in the reference section below.</li> <li>In <b>result and discussion</b>, a reference (Nester et al., 1995) is missing in the reference section below. And there is a reference (Rodriquez et al., 2007) but in the reference section below, its year is written 2017. In one paragraph, refer <b>Table 3.2b, Table 3.3b</b> is highlighted but these tables are not found in the entire manuscript.</li> <li>The second last para of manuscript should come under heading of conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the title of manuscript also include proximate composition along with microbial assessment so proximate analysis should also be mentioned in abstract in brief (1-2 lines).</li> <li>In introduction the lines giving similar meaning are written again and again in a different way. For ex- the starting of 4<sup>th</sup> para from (These fruits are----- adjacent infected fruits) is already mentioned in the first para. The only difference is in language or in some words but giving same meaning, so it should be like this.</li> <li>In result and discussion, somewhere it is written whole 'figure' and somewhere only 'fig' and spelling of tomatoes is also not correct in some figures.</li> <li>There should be uniformity in writing style of all main headings.</li> </ul>	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pooja Bhatnagar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Uttaranchal University, India</b>