

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_97323</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Influence of different levels of potassium and zinc on growth, yield and economics of summer groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript could not describe the concepts and works of the study conducted, academically.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are.</p> <p>5. The experiment seems to be conducted scientifically, but the manuscript could not describe it.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p><b>Reviewer's comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The English writing in this manuscript is quite poor in grammar. And also some sentences are repeated. For example, in the first and second paragraphs, the author(s) wrote the same sentence "groundnut is one of the most important ....". And the grammar of sentences is incorrect as well.</li> <li>- The scientific name of groundnut (in the first paragraph of the introduction) must be in italics.</li> <li>- It is found that some units do not comply with academic consistency. For example, lakh ha, lakh tonnes. It should be converted and expressed in million ha, and million tonnes or metric tonnes. The format of productivity units are inconsistent. kg/ha or kg per hectare?</li> <li>- The names of acids written in the third paragraph are incorrect.</li> <li>- In the first sentence of the materials and methods, the author(s) should use another appropriate word instead of "zaid".</li> <li>- It needs to describe the study site's geographic location and also the climatic condition of the area briefly.</li> <li>- The experiment studied both scientific and economic parameters, but the methods of those measurements are not described in the materials and methods.</li> <li>- It is suggested to be a better presentation that the treatments should be summarized in a table.</li> <li>- In the result and discussion, the writing formats of subtitles, and tables (column headings) are inconsistent.</li> <li>- One sentence, "Similar results/findings were reported by ...." is used too repeatedly.</li> <li>- The table numbers are not mentioned in relevant text paragraph(s).</li> <li>- It needs to explain what the abbreviations stand for, accordingly.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It needs to improve its English writing and grammar to meet academic standards.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Zar Ni Zaw
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Thailand