



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	Title: Compatible with the scope of the paper Abstract: Very extensive. The authors should limit themselves to facts about the scope of the conducted research, methodology and results avoiding unnecessary details about for example the importance of the water..... the scientific interest expressed about the alternative water sources etc... these information must be included in the Introduction and not in the abstract, which must be presented concisely, synoptically and comprehensively Introduction: the information given is insufficiently introducing the reads into the so far accomplished progress in wastewater REUSE. More information is necessary to justify the scope and aim of the conducted research The authors are suggested to study the following additional references: 1. Effects of municipal reclaimed wastewater on the macro and microelement status of soil and plants' Fresenius Environmental Bulletin, Vol. 14; No. 11, pp. 1050-1057 (2005) 2. . 'Effects of municipal reclaimed wastewater on the macro and microelements status of soil and of <i>Brassica oleracea var. Italica</i>, and <i>Brassica oleracea var. gemmifera</i>' International Journal 'Agricultural Water Management' Vol. 95, issue 4, pp. 419-426(2008). 3. 'Macro and micronutrient interactions in soil under the effect of <i>Brassica oleracea var. Italica</i>, irrigated with Treated Municipal Wastewater,' International Journal 'Fresenius	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Environmental Bulletin', Vol. 17; No 9a, pp. 1270-1282(2008). 4. . Heavy metal accumulation in Brussels sprouts after irrigation with Treated Municipal Waste Water, Int. Journal Plant Interactions, Taylor and Francis Journals, Vol. 4, No 1, pp. 41-48(2009). 5. Distribution of elemental interactions in Brussels sprouts, under the Treated municipal wastewater', Plant Interactions, Taylor and Francis Journal, Vol. 4, No 3, pp. 219-231. 6. . Elemental antagonism in vegetables under treated municipal wastewater, Journal of Plant Interactions, Vol. 5, No 2, pp. 101-109(2010). 7. . Treated municipal wastewater irrigation impact on olive trees (<i>Olea europaea L.</i>) at Al-Tafilah, Jordan, submitted in Water, Air, Soil pollution, Vol. 217, number 1-4, pp. 185-196(2011). Material and methods: The authors must give the necessary information about the methods used for soil and wastewater analysis They also do not give any information about the strategy of soil sampling Results and discussion: What was the heavy metal determed? It is not enough to write the " Observed heavy metals were within the permissible levels: What official permissible levels the authors refer to ???? Nothing relevant is mentioned in Table 1. How did they arrived to such a conclusion? What method of analysis has been used for the determination of soil P and what are the critical values? Tables and Figures: The tables are well presented, but the figures, especially the part referring to the effect of applied P leaves on Shoot fresh weight (Fig.1) and on photosynthetic rate (Fig 2) is very confusing Conclusions; The conclusions must be documented and be based on experimental data. The simple mentioning them, does mean much	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Language: Well understood FINAL COMMENT : It must be subjected to MAIJOR REVIEW and be resubmitted accordingly for peer review	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer