

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122040
Title of the Manuscript:	STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING RESILIENCE TO ABIOTIC STRESSES IN SUMMER GROUNDNUT
Type of the 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.	The research is important to know the types of irrigation and the use of waste and chemicals such as (salicylic acid, potassium nitrate, and kaolin) to reduce or combat environmental stress on peanut cultivation and production in India.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Strategies for improving resilience against abiotic stresses in summer groundnut	
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.	The abstract of the article comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, need to paragraph formatting	
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.	The manuscript is scientific, But the researcher should study the effect of these chemicals and wastes not only on environmental stress but also their effect on how to increase or stimulate plant resistance. The results need to be reformulated and formatted properly and the discussion is generally long. It is preferable to choose modern sources because the discussion is not about quantity but quality.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Khadeeja Ahmed Sido
Department, University & Country	Duhok University, Iraq