



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_37222
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and regression analysis of various viability and vigour parameters in coriander (Coriandrum sativum 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>In this submission the authors correlated the seedling establishment with different evaluations of seed vigor under two conditions, foliage cutting and application of plant growth regulators. The topic of the study is important; however, in its current state, the submission has several weaknesses.</p> <p>- The abstract must be able to stand on its own, in such a way that a reader must be able to understand your entire study without having to actually read the paper. In its current state, the abstract is not clear, a reader is not able to differentiate between the effect of foliage cutting and the effect of the addition of the plant growth regulators.</p> <p>- The introduction must clearly specify the aim of the study.</p> <p>- The treatment of foliage cutting must be described in the section of "Materials and methods".</p> <p>- It is necessary to specify details of where and when seeds were sown, as well as details of the experimental design.</p> <p>- The authors are encouraged to do a proper discussion of results, including interpretation of the own results, contrasting of data, explaining the own findings with previous reports as need, as well as including the importance and impact of their own work.</p> <p>- Some inconsistencies were found in the manner to present the references. These must be in the format specified in the Guide for Authors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Norma Almaraz Abarca
Department, University & Country	National Polytechnic Institute, México