SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_13689**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Temperature Requirement for Crop Growth and Productivity of Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.) under Dry Western Zone of India**
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	**There are not many literatures in Text. Especially Canver. Also Canver is not true.** **You have write true. It is Canavar and Kaynak. I know this literature.** **The English of manuscript must be edited by native English person.** **The abstract of manuscript was written very simply. You wrote just result.** **There is a conflict between title and abstract. You have to explain how effect of temperature on peanut is. What is temperature? It is not enough.** **The title of manuscript is not true.** **You given just result. You have discussion with another literature. Especially for CGR.** **You used less literature. You have to use more literature. You have control all literature in text and in references cited one by one. You should write true name.** **Statically is not exactly true. You have give group. Because you merged 2 years. Normally you have to give separately years. 2009 and 2010. We have to see whether there are differences between years or not. And** **What is CD? Is it LSD? You have put the value of LSD for every component.** **Your graphics are not good. You have to adjust.**	1. Yes this is Canavar and Kaynak , so I have been made corrected in references. 2. I have been Improved MS 3. Abstract and title is related to each other because heat unit efficiency also considered as temperature factor this is justified with heat unit fig. and table 1. 4. Discussion of CGR seen in crop weather Para or with CGR Para. 5. Data are pooled of 2 years because all conditions are same both of years like date of sowing, varieties, and fertilizers and other experimental situations and pooled weather data also. 6. Information complete regarding to effect of temperature on crop growth and yield 7. Higher production data of yield also ways sow in q ha^{-1}

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Materials and method was written very poorly. This experiment is 3 factors. And you have calculation many parameters. **You have to write all parameter and method.** **What is q ha^{-1}?. Is it kg ha^{-1}?** **Material and method is very bad.** **Where is the aim of this paper in introduction?** **This manuscript should be totally edited. You have to very clearly explain all things in this experiment.** **You have to deeply discussion with another literature.** **Because of having deficiency and poorly.** **You have to very work.** **Enough it is interesting experiment, There is no any novelty parameter. You did not write any novelty and aim in introduction.**	8. Aim of research in line no 40. 9. This work very good and presently productive after experiment in dry western zone in India because farmers were sown groundnut almost in April but this is not suitable date. This finding very good for economic and irrigation saving purpose for the farmers and save natural resource like water very important in dry zone as well economic aspects for farmers.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		