

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	Research Paper

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.	DUE TO PREDICTION OF FIELD PERFORMANCE OF GROUNDNUT VARIETIES THROUGH DIFFERENT VIGOUR TESTS HELPS IN YIELD IMPROVEMENT AND ALSO REDUCE THE LOSSES DUE TO DISEASE OR PEST ATTACK.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	PREDICTING THE FIELD PERFORMANCE OF GROUNDNUT VARIETIES USING SEVERAL 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.	NO ITS OK	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	It is properly written and all result valuable	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No its ok	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Check once the yellow words some correction are mentioned in paper	

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:	Ravi Regar
Department, University & Country	SKN, College of Agriculture, India