



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38746
Title of the Manuscript:	Pepper Seedlings Quality Submitted to Different Substrates and Types of Trays
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	The description from Introduction to the end would be better if it expanded to show that this research is beneficial to humans and / or the environment, not just simply adding knowledge at the laboratory level. In the introduction mentioned the purpose of this research is evaluation of pepper seedling quality. Why need to evaluate it? This needs to be described in the introduction as well. Also please put the novelty of this research at this part. In the methods, it is necessary to add the reasons for the design selection, full description of the acronym, need to be clearly described about the correlation of the table contents and the discussion towards research objectives. In the discussion need to add a description of some previous research results or experts opinion relevant to each analysis result described in this paper. References used could be from journals or references at local to global level. This needs to be given to know the status of the research results towards its development at various levels from local to global. There should be judgment or support of quantitative data for each statement disclosed based on the research results, e.g. on the line 252 ... it should be mentioned the quantitative data from the restriction of water and nutrients.	Corrigido. Corrigido. Corrected, but since almost all works of the literature do not exhibit the chemical analysis of the substrates, it is difficult to improve the discussion, have seen, also, that the present discussion is already supported by the chemical constitutions of the substrates, as well as the volume of the cells.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		