

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99840
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact on Yield Attributes and Yields of Groundnut Varieties under Different Sowing Windows in Western Maharashtra
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. In general, this article provides information about Impact of yield attributes and yields of groundnut varieties under different sowing windows in Western Maharashtra Plain Zone. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but the content is too shallow 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are not sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language/English articles is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	The discussion is shallow.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ary Susatyo Nugroho
Department, University & Country	PGRI Semarang University, Indonesia