

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_119035 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of the Genotype × Environment interaction in Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) Genotypes for Yield and its Contributing Traits under different Dates of Sowing |
| 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.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) |
|--|--|---|
| <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 high yielding genotypes can be used as parents in hybridization programme and further be taken in breeding improvement programmes. The sowing date defines the environmental conditions to which the crop will be exposed in key moments of its developmental cycle so will be of important to the scientific community</p> <p>The discussion part is insufficient. Discussion helps to interpret and describe the significance of the findings in light of what was already known about the research problem being investigated, and to explain any new understanding or fresh insights about the problem after you've considered the findings. Kindly incorporate</p> <p>Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Few references are very old. Literature reviews are strongest when the articles cited are less than 10 years old. More than 10 years old references are considered to be outdated and irrelevant.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | Accepted | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Monika Ray |
| Department, University & Country | Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India |