



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_32722
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF SEED QUALITY IN NATURALLY AGED SEED LOTS OF CORIANDER
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In Figures 1 to 5, the vertical graph lines should be deleted, which will make them more clearly on a glance.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract line 3: Delete "In the present investigation," in the first line. 2. Abstract lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12: Spacing to be justified. 3. Introduction line 17: Spacing to be justified. 4. Materials and methods lines 39, 40, 52, 74: Spacing to be justified. 5. Results & Discussion lines 82, 101, 105, 106, 127, 140, 157, 162: Spacing to be justified. 6. Initiation tabs have been used to some paragraphs, not uniformly for all. 	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Though the title of the paper is "Evaluation of seed quality in naturally aged seed lots of coriander", which fits perfectly with the results described, nowhere in the Discussion section, it has been described about the probable physiological and biochemical causes and impacts on promising or poor performance and expressions in respect of vigor, viability and storability of the superior or inferior genotypes. Few lines with references in this regard may enrich the significance of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Materials & methods described in the Mss are suitable with standard technical standards. 2. Data presented in the Results section are well-controlled. <p>Rectifications suggested (Rectifications are hereby indicated externally, as a Word document of the Mss couldn't be made available on which directly the modifications could be done)</p>	