Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_77753**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Calibration and validation of DSSAT CROPGRO Peanut model for yield and yield attributing characters of groundnut varieties in Northern Agro-Climatic zone of Tamil Nadu**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article focuses an important task: to calibrate and validate the DSSAT CROPGRO peanut model for simulating the potential yield of groundnut, an important oilseed crops grown in subtropical and tropical regions of the world. The methodology is well explained. The results and conclusions are very interesting, indicating the potential for using such approach by different sectors involved, from producers to decision makers.	Thank you for comment sir and carried out all.
Minor REVISION comments		
Comment 1	Is it the DSSAT CROPGRO-Peanut model free for download? If so, why not include this information in the beginning of the model description item? It could be one more attractive for different users! A suggestion!	It is Free software only, Also used and known to people work in this field that why not mentioned sir.
Comment 2	The equations could be better formatted. The authors could use something like this (only suggestions, feel free to use any equation editor): $$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}\Sigma(Pi - Pi)^2}$$ $$NRMSE = 100 \times \left(\frac{RMSE}{Oi}\right)$$ $$Agreement(\%) = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{RMSE}{Oi}\right)$$	Sure sir and correction was made.

Review Form 1.6

Comment 3	References. For me, some references appeared bad formatted. It could be only a question of different softwares used to open the document. Please, verify if there is any problem with references formatting.	Yes sir and corrected
Comment 4	Figure 2 appeared for me displaced to the right side. So, part of the figure is not showed. Please, verify if it is only a matter of different word processor software of if there is a problem in locating this figure.	Problem only on locating the figure and located exactly sir.
Comment 5	Conclusions. The obtained results are really interesting, indicating that has pottential as a useful tool for different users. However, I think that the authors could be less emphatic in the conclusions about the model. Although the work was well conducted, the conclusions are based in only a work. Generalization of the results is risky. The authors could say something like: "Therefore, the results **here obtained** for the validated DSSAT model **indicated that** the model **could be used** for applications such as….". "The model **could** also be used to improve and ….. ". (Only a suggestion of redaction. Feel free to modify in order to achieve this comment).	Ok sir and added sir
Optional/General comments	I recommend the publication after minor corrections	Thank you sir

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

<mark>Kindly see the following link:</mark>

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

<mark>**PART 2:**</mark>

	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)*	-