

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_109939
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Assessment of Morphometric and Agronomic Characteristics of Fifteen Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) Varieties Under Agroecological Conditions of INERA Gimbi station, Democratic Republic of Congo
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are 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 suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript is quite important and adequate for scientific development in the scientific community. Research is designed systematically so that it is easy to understand and interpret scientifically. Manuscripts are arranged systematically starting from problems that arise at the location of researchers and their impact is developed for other regions.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate or suitable with the purpose, method, content, and conclusion in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive with systematics in accordance with the guideline.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript suitable.</p> <p>5. This manuscript is scientifically correct for its field.</p> <p>6. For reference adequacy is adequate, but in terms of recency, it is dominated by references that have been more than five years old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English needs improvement for the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No general comments</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sutrisno
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia