

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_113760</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Growth analysis of coriander (Coriandrum sativum L.) as influenced by different date of sowing and planting geometry under Chhattisgarh plains zone</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Journal article</b>

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community. The study reported on this manuscript was meant to assess the effect of agronomic factors on the production of coriander, especially the interaction effect of sowing date and plant spacing.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the Results and Discussion section needs a lot of improvement.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and most of them are recent. However, there are two citations in the text which have not been shown on the List of References (see comments on the manuscript).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>In some parts of the article, the language/English quality is unsuitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author of this article, despite carrying out statistical analysis of the data, based the discussion on observed numeric trends. The interaction effects of sowing date and plant spacing have not been clearly discussed. Table 3, which was supposed to show the interaction effects, is not clear.</p> <p>The data would have been discussed well had combined analysis been carried out.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hemedi Mkuzi Saha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pwani University, Kenya</b>