

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126544
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of maleic hydrazide foliar application on in situ germination, seed yield and seed quality parameters in groundnut (cv. Dh 86)
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 results of the study presented in this manuscript offer new possibilities in order to facilitate the propagation of the groundnut crop plant, the importance of this manuscript is related to the importance and the ecological and socio-economical value of the studied plant.	-
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The scientific name of the studied species should be mentioned	Included and changed as per the suggestions
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, the abstract should be re-worked and should follow the scientific methodology of how to structure of the ideas in an abstract.	Abstract Changed
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Thank You
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 introduction needs to be developed; the study is not well presented on this subsection. The Material and methods needs minor revisions. I suggest to use more statistical tools to discuss the results.	Revised as per the suggestions. With respect to these parameters only CRD and RCBD designs can be used for results and discussion chapter.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, more references are required	I presented only less parameters in this manuscript that's why the references are less
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	