

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105878</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nutrient Uptake and Quality Parameters of Groundnut as Influenced by Gypsum and CaMS Super application</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

## 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Abstract was written with more words, may be restricted to 250 to 300 words.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Methodology part lacking with analytical procedures and formulas followed</p> <p>No</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Abstract : Words may be restricted Introduction : Review work on nutrients uptake and quality need to be addressed, since, the focus of the article falls in that regime. <b>Methodology part lacking with analytical procedures and formulas followed</b> Initial soil analysis references and methodology missing</p> <p>Results and discussion: Needs recent research contribution <b>Conclusion: Conclusion was wrong. In results and discussion, it was stated about uptake of nutrients and quality, but it was concluded with yield data which is not at given in the results.</b> <b>NEEDS MAJOR REVISION</b></p> <p><b>All the data were presented monotonously in table alone, some of the parameters may be given as graphs.</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>1.All the references old, and there is no new references after 2020 2.Missing references to be included: Singh, 2009 3. References cited in the following numbers are not given in any part of the text, hence, the references are need to be removed S.No.1,7,8,14,15,16,22,25,26 (Extra references), to be removed 4. Recent references to be added 5. Brady, N.C: Year to be verified. Given as 2004 in text, but in reference, quoted as 2002, should be corrected.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>D. Jegadeeswari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</b>