

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104816
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF POTASSIUM AND SULPHUR ON GROWTH, YIELD AND PRODUCTIVITY OF 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study is extremely useful to adopt a new package of practices for increasing the yield of coriander, so farmers earn more income per unit area. Try to make it effective (Influences of various doses of potassium and Sulphur based fertilizers on growth, yield, and productivity of coriander (<i>Coriandrum sativum</i> L.)) In abstract section needs significant improvement. More focus should be on objectives, results, and salient findings. Add why you choose this research, background, without potassium and Sulphur what kind of issues and why you chose these studies. Introduction and result sections are poorly written and did not sufficiently explain the main focus of the study with supporting literature. In the introduction, the session add the importance of the study, the need of the study with references, and why you go for potassium and Sulphur based fertilizers. In material \$ methods include plant protection measures taken during the trial. Lines No 61, and 63, effects potash mention findings that match with any references and explained how help in plant growth improvement with references. Lines No 84, and 87, effects Sulphur mention findings that match with any references and also interpret why Sulphur and Potash are not effects in some traits separately. Also, add combined effects of treatments both potassium and Sulphur, and with reference interpret which traits give positive results and which give negative results with reasons and references. In regression analysis section justified with proper interpretation of the coefficient of determination, and based on the coefficient of determination which fertilizer is best interpreted with references. Manuscript is scientifically correct but add more literature and improve the very hard discussion and conclusion section for future uses of identifying best results and mention the proper package of practices for future utilization of that dose of potassium and sulphur. Manuscript writes as usual thesis type, don't do that? Please followed journal author guidelines to standardize the result and discussion section. References are mentioned very well, try to add more literature for a strong interpretation of your findings. Justified your findings with recent references and implications in future agronomical research and farming community. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Language quality is medium and it is suitable for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript writes as usual thesis type, don't do that? Please followed journal author guidelines to standardize the result and discussion section. The introduction, result and discussion section and sub-section written are very poor without justification and references. explain the main focus of the study with supporting literature. The regression analysis section is not justified properly not add any references to the previous finding. In conclusion, the section's findings are not justified scientifically, to fulfill the aim of the study and what future use of this study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajesh D Vekariya
Department, University & Country	Navsari Agriculture University, India