



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9293
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, physiological, yield and quality response in chilli (capsicum annuum L.) under wastewater irrigation and different levels of phosphorus
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	Abstract: 1. In methodology part, there is difference in units 'kgNha¹, kgKha¹ kgPha¹' with units used in 'Material and methods', please check 2. Do not use abbreviation in abstract without giving full form Introduction: It is well written and citing previous studies Material and Methods: 3. Page 2, Line 58, Tap water is abbreviated as 'GW' while in Table 1 ground water is abbreviated as 'GW'. Correct it throughout MS 4. Reference are not cited properly according to journal guidelines in main text, eg., Page 2, line 72, 'nitrogen was estimated by the method of [20]' should be cited as 'nitrogen was estimated by the method of Lindner [20]'. Manuscript is not checked properly and this error is present throughout text with most of the references. Need to revise thoroughly. 5. Page 3, line 181-182, which version of SPSS was used? Result and Discussion: 6. Table 1 and 2: 'p^H' should be 'pH'; 'PO₄⁻³' should be 'PO₄³⁻'; same is the case with other elements; In table 2,	1. I have checked all units in methodology and correct it. In material method i have correct the unit in line 56 and 57. 2. I have checked abstract and gave full form of all abbreviations. 3. I have checked page 2, line 58 and correct the TW as GW and also corrected the groundwater as GW and wastewater as WW throughout the manuscript. 4. I have checked all the references throughout the text and correct it in line 60, 68, 71 and 72. 5. I have used SPSS statistics 17.0 6-7. I have corrected p^H as pH in table 1 in line 84 and in table 2 at line 123 and also corrected the symbolic form of other elements from line 129 to



SDI Review Form 1.6

	use of symbolic forms of elements name would be better 7. Use 'complete' and proper caption for tables Conclusion: 8. Please rewrite conclusion section removing methodological and result part giving significant outcomes of the study References: 9. There are some mistakes in uniformity of reference style. some eg., use of and before last author (ref. 28), page number (ref. 15), journal name and abbr (ref. 50-51). It need to check thoroughly 10. Number of references should be decreased upto 50 max.	139. 8.I have rewrite the conclusion from line 424 to 430 9. I have checked references thoroughly and corrected it in line 438, 442, 454, 466, 518, 535 and 537.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Several errors of English grammar eg. 1. Page 1, Line 21, Use 'a suitable' in place of 'an suitable' 2. Page 2, Line 62, use 'standard' in place of 'standarded' 3. Page 2, Line 65, Please Provide made of AAS and also use full form of DAS at its first use 4. In MS, first use of Phosphorus (P), Nitrogen (N) etc. should be followed by their subsequent uses as P, N etc.	1. I have corrected an suitable as a suitable in page 1, line 20. 2. I have corrected standarded as standard in page 2, line 58. 3. Full form of AAS is (Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer) provided in line 62 and DAS is (Days After Sowing) provided in line 62 4. Throughout MS i have corrected and gave subsequent P and N in place of phosphorus and nitrogen.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the manuscript is well written, significant and relevant to journal's subject area.	