

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98849
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic variability and correlation studies in F6 and F7 families of groundnut derived from the cross GKVK-13 × KCG-2
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important and has necessary references</p> <p>The manuscript is good but not clearly synchronized in proper hierarchy..... need step by step clarification</p> <p>Yes the study is simple and up to the mark the main objective of the study but how it checked neither showed nor mentioned clearly.</p> <p>There is no research question</p> <p>No hypothesis</p> <p>No objective mentioned</p> <p>Results are not mentioned clearly</p> <p>Weak discussion</p> <p>Weak conclusion</p> <p>Please clearly write down these things</p> <p>1 objective</p> <p>2 research question</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>More explanation is required with current English</p> <p>The language should be more explanatory.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript is fine and ready to publish after minor correction</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:	Muhammad Sajjad Ali Gill
Department, University & Country	University of the Punjab, Pakistan