

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98434
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of molybdenum and zinc on Growth and Yield Attributes of Zaid Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)
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:

(<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)	1. Yes. It gives details information on how molybdenum and zinc improved yield growth 2. Effect of molybdenum and zinc on Growth and Yield Attributes of Zaid Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.) in Prayagraj, India 3. Give the full meaning of CRF (You cannot use abbreviation without given the full meaning first). Secondly, give details on where the experiment was conducted in your Abstract, is it greenhouse or field work? Lastly, include brief summary of your research conclusion 4. Scientifically, the manuscript is ok. 5. The references are recent but not sufficient enough.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The conclusion is not well detailed, work more on it for better improvement. Yes, the English quality are ok.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is ok. But the necessary correction should be effected so that the article can be accepted nationwide and promote the quality of the publisher.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olakayode Abiodun Ojo
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria