

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124657
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTION OF FIELD PERFORMANCE OF GROUNDNUT VARIETIES THROUGH DIFFERENT VIGOUR TESTS
Type of the Article	New Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitely this manuscript is useful for the scientific community. Recommendation of a variety for a particular Agro climatic zone of the farmers is very much important. Once you select one variety, then you can further go for its complete package and practices experiment. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, Evaluation of field performance of groundnut varieties through different vigour tests	
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>Abstract of the article is not comprehensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One cannot get a clear knowledge about the experiment from the abstract. There are no indications of the varieties and the layout plan of the experiment. The % change of different characters is also not mentioned. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though it is appropriate but needs more clarification. The result discussion should be more clear. There should be subheadings for different parameters. CV value should be rechecked in some parameters. The writing pattern should be improved. 	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mention the Recommended dose of fertilizer of that area. The conclusion pattern is not satisfactory. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient and incorporate recent ones on or after 2020.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Though the language is ok but can be improved to maintain the standard of the journal.	
Optional/General comments	The study is limited with only one season. It should be continued for another season for validation.	

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:	Meenakhi Prusty
Department, University & Country	Odisha University of Agriculture And Technology, India