

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98659
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of genetic variability parameters and parent-offspring correlation, regression in groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)
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)	Yes. But the study was made during Summer of 2017, therefore, while comparing the findings of others work, same season be taken. Soil quality also changes the yield of groundnut in relation to water, weather (temperature, humidity, rainfall, etc), which should be part of the study. Yes. Comments on the body of the MS. Yes, but too many numerical. May be avoided. Nos. of table be reduced. Ok. Some references have been made after the study period. So, the knowledge available after the study couldn't be made use while carrying out the study.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Adequate.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Kerketta
Department, University & Country	India