

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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	Original 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.	This manuscript tells about the effect of MH on germination, yield, and seed quality in groundnut through foliar appliaction	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Impact of Maleic Hydrazide Foliar Application on Germination, Yield, and Seed Quality in Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea)"	
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.	Do revise as per comments	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is informative	
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.	Just follow the journal guidelines of formatting of references	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some latest references should be added for last 5 yrs of research	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, its good	
Optional/General comments	Introduction should contain at least 15 latest references related to study PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Aman Tutlani
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (SKUAST-K), India