

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_125668
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between weather parameters and agrometeorological indices with pod yield of groundnut
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article addresses critical aspects of groundnut cultivation under different climatic conditions, making it a valuable resource for researchers, farmers, and policymakers alike.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is relevant but could be refined for clarity and focus. I would suggest the "Effects of Weather Conditions on Pod Yield in Groundnut Varieties"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article focused on a general overview of the study, including its objectives, methodology, and key findings. DELETION: Remove phrases that are repetitive or unclear, such as "the results of present investigation indicated that pod yield of was negatively correlated." This can be simplified to "The study found a negative correlation between pod yield and..."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons: The study employs a well-structured experimental design, utilizing four different groundnut varieties sown on three distinct dates. And analyzed how different climatic conditions affect pod yield across different phenological stages. Also the data collection of daily meteorological and phenological observations, ensure that the analysis is based on reliable and relevant data.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript seems to be limited in both quantity and recent issues, which may affect the overall robustness of the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript require significant improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. The grammar and syntax, consistency in terminology, punctuation issues, technical jargon are the basic language quality for scholarly communication. The article need proofreading and editing, consistent use of terminology, complex sentences into simpler structures, and need explanations for technical terms for the readers understanding.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some sentences are very complex and could be simplified for better readability. For example, breaking down long sentences into shorter ones would enhance clarity. Failed to provide definitions or explanations for technical terms when they first appear in the text to aid understanding for a broader audience.</p> <p>Author should provide more detail on how the correlation analysis was conducted, which should include what statistical software he/she used to bring out the finding. Therefore, it is not clearly stated which correlations were statistically significant and moreover the tables should include the p-values where ever applicable.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	D. Samuel Sounderaraj Singh
Department, University & Country	Gurukul Lutheran Theological College and Research Institute, India