

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104048
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of screen aperture size for grading of dhaincha
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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript explains the effects of screen aperture size on seed grading accuracy as well as the determination of seed quality. The findings of this study may be beneficial to the community in terms of the applicability of the technique.</p> <p>Need improvement</p> <p>Need improvement</p> <p>Need improvement</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Lacks recent references. The latest is in 2016.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I would suggest adding seed after dhaincha. Much better if can provide the scientific name of dhaincha in the title.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>"Seed recovery percentage in 1.4 mm sieve was higher than other sieves and also quality of seeds obtained in 2.2 mmsieves was higher than the Minimum Seed Certification Standards." This sentence was confusing because later you mentioned: "The graded seeds obtained from the sieve 2.0 mm recorded the higher seed recovery (92.99 %)"</p> <p>The last sentence repeats the same conclusion: "Using the sieve of 2.0 mm (S), higher recovery of good seed with germination percentage and physicalpurity percentage above acceptable limits of Indian Minimum Seed Certification standard (IMSCS) can be obtained."</p> <p>Rewrite the findings in the abstract to reduce redundant and confusing facts. Please summarize your findings and draw some benefits from your outcomes and future direction.</p>	
	<p>A general overview is presented; however, the introduction lacks a comprehensive literature review on the topic. Most of the citations are from Anonymous authors.</p>	
	<p>"Freshly harvested bulk seed of dhaincha harvested from National Seed Project (Crops), Seed Block, UAS, Raichur" – please elaborate on the location. The longitude and latitude coordinates could be beneficial.</p>	
	<p>"A laboratory experiments was conducted to standardize of the seed aperture size" – what does the standardize mean? Need more clarification. The sentence need improvement.</p>	
	<p>Physical purity methodology needs to be explained. What does the "Weight of pure seed fraction" mean? What about " Weight of the components" ?</p>	
	<p>Test weight From the seeds taken out from each replication treatment wise, one thousand seeds were drawn randomly from all the four replications and weighed.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	The sentence was unclear and needs improvement. Is it possible to change the subtitle into Seed weight?	
	Seedling dry weight "From the seeds kept in laboratory for germination test, using between paper method, ten seedlings....." Seed or seedling? The sentence was unclear and needs improvement.	
	Seedling vigour index (SVI): what's the purpose?	
	The statistical analysis method should be in a separate subtitle.	
	Need major improvement. A very brief discussion is available in each subsection. Some results need clarification about why the analysis has been carried out & why it is important. For example: Seedling vigour index, Index I & II, how these results answering the objective?	
	"which is above the minimum seed certification standards" – what are the minimum standard?	
	S.Em± CD at 5 % What are these mean? Need abbreviations. Significant analysis – which data shows statistical significance to others?	
	Where are other treatment's images? 1.4mm, 2.0mm?	
	Is this the same data from Table 1-4? If yes, choose only one way of presenting the data.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramisah Mohd Shah
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia