



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_37332
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of seed coating polymer in Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan L.)
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	<p>Place an introductory sentence in your abstract as an overview of the study.</p> <p>Remove all the references used in the introduction, methodology, and discussion (for example, Jagathambal, 1996; Punithavathi, 1997). Used only the designated number in the references for example [3-4]. Don not used both.</p> <p>In order to identify easily the trend of the treatment effect it is much better to present it in graphical form.</p> <p>Add letter designation to the data which has significant result to determine the differences among treatment means and add footnotes.</p> <p>Revise your conclusion base on the objective and result of the study.</p> <p>Revise all the references. Follow the given format of the journal.</p>	All necessary changes have been made based on reviewer valuable comments
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Right additional methods in your abstract (methods, techniques, and design used)</p> <p>In you methodology did you use an instrument to determine the moisture content of the seeds? How many days is the duration of the study? Please specify.</p>	Fresh and untreated seeds were used for the study, the duration of study was tagged with no of days taken for various seed quality determing test such as germination, SVI etc need not necessary to coat specifically
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is very well written. This is a good research and will be beneficial to some researchers, especially individual dealing with seed production. Although, there are few comments but once it was revised this paper must be very useful. It must be considered for publication.</p> <p>The introduction was written with proper manner and background and importance of the study was well emphasized, it is already arranged according to importance following the top to bottom approach. The justification why the study has to be conducted was well presented.</p> <p>The Methods are carefully described. The methods are well presented. The used of precise term was adopted.</p> <p>The Results section was written very well only that there is a need to add letter designation on the treatment means.</p> <p>The Discussion section was more informative because the authors were placed results in the context of previously published studies more so than in the current paper.</p> <p>Revise references base on journal format.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Referances have been revised</p>