

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105639
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and Molybdenum on Growth, Yield and Economics of Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)
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)	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community, as the combination of sulfur and molybdenum offers higher yields and a very attractive cost/benefit ratio.</p> <p>Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</p> <p>Yes, but the author must show the benefit(s) of this study in one sentence that will serve as a conclusion</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not very appropriate because several elements are missing in the methodology, in particular, the description of the study site and the data collection.</p> <p>Yes, i think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are insufficient, especially in the introduction, some must be added, nevertheless, some references are not too recent, especially those dating from before 2000</p> <p>(comments are written in the manuscript)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beugré N'Djiha Isabelle
Department, University & Country	Centre National de Recherche Agronomique, Côte d'Ivoire