



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7788
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF IRRIGATION INTERVALS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF BELL PEPPER (<i>Capsicum annuum</i>) IN A TROPICAL SEMI-ARID REGION
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The summary is sufficiently informative, however it is very extensive, it is recommended to make it shorter. I believe that the words leaf area and stem diameter adds nothing to the key words. I suggest deleting it or replacing it with another. Materials and methods. It does not specify in what year experiments are developed. It uses tables that are relevant, which should exploit more. It suggests updating references. The document uses 17 references, 7 corresponds to the years 2007-2013; 10-the years 1983-2006. It is suggested that I expanded this section with literature most recently to strengthen its argument.	We considered the abstract and implore the reviewer to allow us leave the abstract in its present state. Since everything we wrote was very important in the abstract Stem diameters and leaf area were removed from keywords and replaced with growth parameters and semi-arid zone. The year of experiment has been included in the experimental set up sub-section. The references have been updated with recent references. We however left two old references (2002 and 2006) that we considered very important to this research.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		