

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85795
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of nitrogen and spacing on growth and yield of summer Groundnut ( Arachis hypogaea L. )
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript speaks of the influence of nitrogen on the growth of peanuts (Arachis hypogaea L.). I consider they should add the support in the introduction section where they talk about the importance of peanut cultivation in India and mention figures, however I do not see the appropriate references that support the data. Add in that section the justification for this study. I would like to see in the development part a review of the state of the art of previous works that support the choice of these nitrogen concentrations. As well as the methodological support to carry out the process of irrigation and fertilization among other parameters suitable for the cultivation of peanuts. They must also include graphs of the comparison of the growth vs the control as well as images of the test in the three nitrogen levels.</p> <p>A broader discussion of the results and their impact is also required.</p> <p>Additionally, since 2001 it has been shown that nitrogen improves the yield of peanut crops, the authors must make it clear where the contribution to the knowledge of this work.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>I check in anti plagiarism software and the results are in the allowed parameters.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Graciela -Hernandez y Orduña
Department, University & Country	El Colegio de Veracruz, Mexico