

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88342
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of different fertilizer levels on growth and yield of coriander. (Coriandrum sativum L.) cv- JD-1.
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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>It is a well-done work with highly useful information; however, the way in which the entire paper was written, mainly in the “RESULTS AND DISCUSSION” section, presents some particularities that hinder the understanding. Please consider:</p> <p>* to add a paragraph immediately after “RESULT AND DISCUSSION” title explaining that the primary results were summarized in tables 1- 5 and Figures 1-5. In your text these tables and figures are at the end of the Results section; thus it is quite difficult to follow the explanation on Results sub-items;</p> <p>* in the same way, the figures abscissa cite treatments from 1 to 8, but the respective legends do not present what such treatment is about. This information will only be available in the CONCLUSION section. If this information were added at the beginning of the Results section, through a new table or just inserting one more column on Table 1, it would be very useful.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please, verify such data:</p> <p>“The maximum plant height (14.55cm, 70.97cm and 93.17cm)” – maximum mean value according to Table 1 (the same for any other value on the paragraph). A sentence explaining that all data are average values would be quite useful;</p> <p>“secondary branches per plant (21.86), first flowering (52.3 days)” – 52.83?;</p> <p>“secondary branches per plant (17.83), first flowering (49.67 days)” “secondary branches per plant (16.13), first flowering (49.67 days)” - 47.67?;</p> <p>“seed yield per plant (5.65g), seed yield per plot (1.84 kg)” – these numbers are not on the tables;</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>All symbols/acronyms are not explained as soon as they appear. For instance FYM, VC, OM, RDF, DAS are first explained at the bottom of Table 1.</p> <p>Your text uses “study”, not “our study”, which is correct, but does not help understanding. I would change it. Just one example “To standardize the rate of three major nutrients nitrogen, phosphorus and potash, studies have shown”</p> <p>Maybe, you could rephrase some sentences: “Prior to sowing coriander variety JD-1 seeds were splitted into two halves by rubbing seeds were treated with thiram @ 2 g/kg of seeds was done thoroughly against seed borne diseases” “These growth responses were most probablydue to the production of plant growth substances and other growth promoting substances by vermicompost applications the metabolic process of the plant gets stimulated including increased uptake of nutrients through insoluble nutrient like P gets converted in to soluble nutrients by the activation of desirable enzymes”</p> <p>Please, read your text once more, there are some misspellings, such as “Kymore pleatue (plateau?) and Satpura hills of Madhya Pradesh” or “Choudary <i>et al.</i> (2011)” (Choudhary?), Sahu <i>et al.</i>,(2014) (2013?)</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Lúcia Pereira da Silva
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil