

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101906
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Application of Speed Breeding Technologies in Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.): An Advance Approach
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The work presented is relevant and important in the agricultural area; however, it is recommended to take care of the form, style, syntax, and give order and coherence to what is intended to be demonstrated</p> <p>2. The title of the work seems appropriate to me.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, taking care of the order of the ideas; In addition to adjusting to the essential elements that it must contain.</p> <p>4. The sections and structure, if they are correct, except take care of the style (for the use of capital letters - see the section guides - if required, change to sentence type).</p> <p>5. The work can be improved both in substance and in the form of writing.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient; however, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references.</p> <p>In the conclusions section it is recommended to review, suggesting that they have order, coherence and be concise; considering what conclusions are really those that can be drawn from the information presented. Take care of the style / way of including the figures in the text. Some details (in color) are marked in the manuscript, which must be attended to, among others.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A minor revision is required regarding the writing of English Where available, the URLs of the references are provided. The text must comply with the style and bibliographic requirements described in the guidelines for authors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Necessary suggestions to carry out Reference to a journal: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Reference to a book: 2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles. 3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006; 16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work: This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, Mexico