



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_33593</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Phenotypic expressions of Pepper in treatments of <i>Glomus deserticola</i>, <i>Pleurotus pulmonarius</i> compost and Poultry manure</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> It should start from 1.0 not 0.0. Lines 42-43 has no clear meaning. Objective was clearly stated. Introduction was good.</p> <p><b>2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS</b> Describe the standard procedure with reference to the inoculation and provide reference for it. <b>Growth Assessment :</b> Describe how the growth parameters were taken. Describe each of them, from plant height, etc. <b>Harvesting:</b> How was the harvesting data taken with respect to harvest area. <b>Results:</b> The statements should be spaced by paragraphs. They are lumped together and it does not make the work neat. <b>Tables:</b> Provide Lsd values and CV for the results on the tables were not given. It makes the letters provided meaningless. Provide units for table 5 (weight) Is weak after planting part of the correlation table 7? Shift the treatment on table 8 to its proper place.</p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b> The following are not found in the text Smith and Smith 1999 Nelson and Jenson 1999 Eldon Everheart et al 2009 Irvine 1956 Walker and Sollaries 1961 Kloos and McCulligh 1982</p>	Ok



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	<b>Gemma et al 2005</b> <b>Odebode 2005</b> <b>Jonathan et al 2013</b> <b>Fidama 2009</b> <b>Ekanayake et al 2004</b> <b>Poulton et al 1998</b> <b>Lines 334-335 Smith et al 2003 is not in text but in reference.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		