



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12825
Title of the Manuscript:	LEAF EPIDERMAL ANATOMY IN FIVE VARIETIES OF <i>CAPSICUM ANNUUM</i> L. SOLANACEAE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 12. Trichome is also absent in var. <i>abbreviatum</i> according to table 2. Lines 42-44: Need to cite a reference here. Lines 49-54: Instead of just listing the references here, the authors should give a couple of examples how the leaf micromorphological and epidermal features have been used in plant identification. Also, since the stomata and trichomes are the major traits the authors used to differentiate the five varieties, the authors should give some background information about these two traits in the introduction. Line 76: The S.I formula $S.I. = S/S + E \times 100$ does not make sense to me. Lines 89-114: Should divide into two paragraphs with one focusing on stomata and the other focusing on trichome. Also please give better summary and description of the data in table 1 & 2 and Figs. 1-10. Lines 115-123: The authors should focus more on the differences between these five varieties and give a	Agreed with the reviewer and has been amended Reference cited Agreed with the reviewer and more reference cited to support how leaf micromorphological character were used in plant identification Agreed with the reviewer and amended accordingly Rewritten Agreed Ok Ok



SDI Review Form 1.6

	summary of how to use the stomata and trichomes to differentiate them. The data in Table 1 and table 2 are not presented in an easy to read style. For example, using lower and upper instead of abaxial and adaxial, and using + /- instead of present /absent may make it easier for the reader to get the information. Table 2 Epidermal Cell Density should separate Range and Mean. In addition, the first set of data doesn't make sense 18(26.40)25. Figure 1-10: The figure legends need more information to make the readers understand the figure. Also the font sizes are not consistent. The arrows in the figures pointed to the opposite directions. Why are there two different colours for the figures? The authors should show both the anisocytic and tetracytic stomata on the upper and lower leaf surfaces of all the five varieties. Also three varieties have trichomes, why did the author only show two? It looks like the trichomes look different in shape and size, but there is no such description or discussion in the manuscript.	Lower and upper are not the scientifically appropriate words for leaf surfaces. Ok Ok No Amended Both are shown The other picture is missing
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		