

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97925
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of micronutrients on growth and yield of groundnut (Arachis hypogea L.) varieties
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Absolutely, it is crucial because it will enable farmers to grow groundnuts with the proper nutrients in the appropriate amounts.</p> <p>Of course, To pique the reader's attention and encourage them to read the complete report, the abstract should be revised to include all of the research's accomplishments. The manuscript's parts and subsections are all flawless. The main problem is that the author did not adequately explain how many variables He/she was dealing with when He/she stated that there would be nine treatments and three replications. The Material and Method, which should include the treatment arrangement and replication, were also pretty poor in that they were not shown. Moreover, there was no mention of the tables anywhere in the text. The table of ANOVA, which should have contained the treatment, block, error, and total to evaluate the significance of the Hypotheses, did not appropriately interpret and report the ANOVA usage. The manuscript is consequently not accurate from a scientific standpoint. The references don't present any problems.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Agreed, but it would be better if it were paraphrased.	
Optional/General comments	It is preferable to ask the author to edit the manuscript to conform to standard formatting.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Quadri Moruff Abidemi
Department, University & Country	Muslim Community College of Health Science and Technology, Nigeria