

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111623
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, yield and quality of rabi groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) as influenced by sources of calcium and sulphur under different site specific nitrogen management in rice-groundnut cropping system
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community. It assessed the growth, yield and quality of Groundnut intercropped with rice under different nitrogen management practices as influenced by different sources of calcium and sulphur. Various parameters like oil content, oil yield, plant height at harvest, number of nodules per plant, pod weight, nodule weight, dry matter, leaf area index, shelling out turn, number of kernels, pod yields as a result of different sources of calcium and sulphur application were determined and compared with previous works in literature.</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate, despite having so many variables.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but should not be separated into sections. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Some of the references are too old and need to be replaced with recent ones.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Anthonia Eyitayo Eseyin
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria