

Review Form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJECC_103713
Manuscript Title:	Study of Genetic Divergence in Genotypes of Peanut (Arachishypogaea L.)
Item Type	Original Research Article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p><u>Mandatory</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: The keywords must be worked with the UNESCO THESAURUS, which is a universal glossary to locate the text within a specific spectrum of sciences, in addition, it allows the development of the study: Agriculture – Genetic engineering – Peanut plant.... The problem and background of this product are clear and relevant; the justification indicates the importance of the product for the health and improvement of agriculture. The justification could be expanded with more references to the latest studies on the subject elsewhere. The context is adequate, the experimental design by plots is propitious as well as the selected population. The formula for reading results is pertinent. The results are compared with a single study on this subject, which indicates its originality, at least in this area. The new findings on the way of planting contribute and favor the development of future crops. As the objective does not exist, its scope cannot be defined.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>3. It is necessary to indicate the objective of the investigation; the methodology used is clear; It is necessary to mention the conclusions.</p> <p>4. The structure of the writing adjusts to the investigative and scientific requirements.</p> <p>5. Due to the results generated, as well as the findings that contribute to improving the benefits of this product, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. There are no updated references on the subject, which corroborates its originality and contribution.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	Appropriate	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador