

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119498
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Organic, Inorganic and Integrated Nutrient Management practices on Yield and Economics of Kharif Groundnut.
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The importance of the research carried out is the information on the effects of applying the various types of fertilization management in a particular area of India. The importance increases if the information required at 5., will be given because this information allows the GIS database and establish statistical models of fertilization management to geo-climatic conditions, which allows access (in time) and dynamics climatic changes applied to the groundnut crops. 2. Yes the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. The grammatical control and academic expression are recommended (for example with the Quill Bot program, the free or superior version). A map of the five locations of the experimental fields is recommended in the chapter materials and methods. 4. Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. There is some experimental evidence: photographs of the experimental field, photography's of the evolution of plants on the crops of groundnuts to which were applied different fertilization recipes, in various stages of evolution, mandatory for harvesting (see [1] from the literature added by the reviewer); A map with the location of the experimental area and the five areas with large Groundnut cultures. I recommend the authors give the coordinates of the Experiment Camp (a reference point), because trying to find the location on the satellite maps of Google Earth, the program offers at least seven locations in the southern part of India. This means that the location is not sufficiently precise, as well as the geo-climatic conditions. In the exposure of the results, one or two graphic representations of the performances of the three management methods would be useful, such as in [2, 3] from the literature added by the reviewer. The calculation formulas for the economic indicators and other quality indicators used must be specified where they are listed, ie in the chapter Materials and Methods, as in [3] from the literature added by the reviewer, for example. In order to adapt the results in other areas, for the purpose of extending the research results, it is recommended to publish the analysis of the soils of the five locations of the experimental field, for example in [4] from the literature added by the reviewer. For the same purpose, the main elements of the climatic regime can be given in the experiment area, as, for example, in [5] from the literature added by the reviewer. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. But there are other sources, quite a lot, which show how often the subject is approached. Because the authors do not introduce in the work evidence of carrying out the experimental research, required by us at 5., nor graphic representations of the data and/or results, we have introduced some bibliographic sources in the literature brought by the reviewer. <p>Literature added by the reviewer</p> <p>[1] https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Groundnut_crop_in_Chittoor_district,_Andhra_Pradesh.jpg</p> <p>[2] Argaw A., Organic and inorganic fertilizer application enhances the effect of Bradyrhizobium on nodulation and yield of peanut (Arachis hypogea L.) in nutrient depleted and sandy soils of Ethiopia, International Journal Of Recycling of Organic Waste in Agriculture 6(6), 2017</p> <p>[3] Liu, Zheng, Yuheng Song, Liqun Ge, Xiaoman Pan, Yingming Zhao, Lina Cheng, Ying Li, Wenting Wang, and Xinyu Liu. "Impact of Various Organic Fertilizers on the Growth, Yield, and Soil Environment of Peanuts Subjected to Continuous Cropping Obstacles". <i>Polish Journal of Environmental Studies</i> 32 no. 4 (2023): 3683-3693. doi:10.15244/pjoes/164404.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In the text of the manuscript, there are many grammatical errors. Partially I reported them in notes. To eliminate these errors I suggest language control with the text editor and special programs: Grammarly, Quill Bot, free or upper versions. Also, to give the language a more academic character, I suggest the use of the Quill Bot Paraphrasing program. Before these operations are negotiated with the publisher version of the agreeable English version: UK, USA, India, etc.	
Optional/General comments	The note granted to the work (5) and the recommendation (help followed by a new review) are due to the shortcomings indicated at 5., and the modest quality of writing (grammatical errors, low-level academic language), without the equations of quality parameters, without supporting images of the experimental activity, without graphic representations of the experimental data and the results. The article cannot be published in the current form and it is recommended to be published only if after the major review, the data of the experiment (experimental plan, sketches, photographs, etc.) are introduced, ie what is required at 5.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	INMA, Bucharest