



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	

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Should be revised after the comments in the main body of the paper have been affected.</p> <p>LINE 38... "DH-352-1 and Hisar Anand"..Use a 'Comma' instead of 'and'</p> <p>LINE 41... "All the 45 seed lots stored under ambient condition" in the materials descriptions, only 3 seed lots were used but in this section 45 seed lots are used....which one is the correct figure? What is ambient condition?</p> <p>LINE 49:...Revise this section to indicate that the hundred seeds were picked from each seed Lot for the fifteen genotypes. In addition, you do not have to repeat the names of the genotypes here as you have already given their names in the materials description section</p> <p>LINE 74... "One hundred seeds of each 75 varieties/genotypes of all the lots in four replicates placed in..."Was this done after the 120hrs to test for germination %? If so this should be stated!</p> <p>LINE 79:...Was there any interaction between genotype and seed Lot in all the variables?..the author indicated in LINE 82"minimum seed weight was recorded for DH-341 (13.98g) in freshly harvested seed" IF there was an interaction between genotype and seed Lot, the figures reported for Hisar Surbhi (18.18g) and DH-339 were for which seed Lots?</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>LINE 83: ... "Maximum test weight was found in freshly harvested seed lots irrespective of the genotypes" Contradicts LINE 82.....</p> <p>FIGURE 1, 2 and 3: Wrong presentation of results....Genotype is a discrete and not continuous value. Each is distinct and there's no grey area in between the genotypes. Use of a bar graph and not a line graph is suggested.</p> <p>- The presentation of results for all the other variables is not clear – were there interactions between genotype and Seed Lot? What were the outcomes?</p> <p>Table 2: "Effect of natural ageing on accelerated aged seeds of coriander genotypes" what results are these? What was being tested and what results were obtained?</p> <p>The authors should provide conclusions that are in line with the objectives of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors need to seek assistance of an English translator.</p> <p>The outlining of results is confusing and the discussion of the same is weak, the authors should strengthen this section by making reference to documented evidence.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Cecilia M. Onyango</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Plant Science and Crop Protection, University of Nairobi, Kenya</i>