



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_51958
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant responses of three Pepper (<i>Capsicum annuum</i>) varieties against Pepper Venal Mottle Virus
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>)

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	<p>Results section The authors should find more reasons to explain why the infested plants of some varieties and their control or other control plants of other varieties. Did the authors come across the possibility of some varieties being "non-hosts" to certain viruses or other pathogens? In a situation where some varieties are non-hosts, there will be very little to choose between the infested plants and the control.</p> <p>Discussion section Lines 181-183: ".....The Chili pepper showed to be more sensible to PVMV infection compared to the others varieties of pepper....." the highlighted word should be "more sensitive"</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should use only one referencing style. At the introduction section, the authors used a combination of "numbering citation" and "full name citation" of some references. See lines 20-22.	
Optional/General comments	This is a very informative paper, well written and contains relevant insight into the antioxidant activities of pepper in response to infection by virus. However, the authors need to revise some of the statements and support some of the categorical statements with literature or earlier studies.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Joseph Adjebeng-Danquah</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>CSIR- CSIR-Savanna Agriculture Research Institute, Ghana</i>