

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 | Economic study |

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> <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>Yes, the manuscript is very important for scientific community because groundnut has a high nutrient need, optimizing mineral nutrition is critical for optimizing yield. On the contrary, groundnut farmers use relatively little fertilizer, resulting in severe mineral nutrient deficits, which are one of the leading causes of low groundnut output.</p> <p>Yes, the title of this article is suitable after modification.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of this article comprehensive to some extent.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct after modification of some words which it writes by red colour.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient after modification which wrote by red colour.</p> <p>No, Thanks, these comments are enough.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, language/English quality of the article is very good and suitable for scholarly communications.</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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name: | Mohamed Fathy Zaki Soliman |
| Department, University & Country | National Research Centre, Egypt |