



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4114
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed performance of selected bottle gourd [<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> (Molina) Standl.].
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript "AJEA_4114" was done one seed characteristics and seedling quality. The study produced some valuable information about seed morphology, seed and seedling quality. But the weak point of the study is number of used genotypes. Six genotypes is very limited number for general conclusion on seed and seedling quality parameters. Beside this, manuscript was well organized and written expects for some typing errors. Manuscript can be published after minor revisions.	1. We acknowledge the reviewer's comments. While we would have wanted to have more genotypes, there was a limitation in the number of locally available landraces and seed number produced per landrace. 2. We have now highlighted this limitation in our conclusions and added that as a future direction, more landrace selections and seeds should be used to increase the accuracy of the study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript can be published after minor revisions pointed out in general comments.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Following correction and additions should be done on the manuscript before publishing. Introduction - Paragraph 1 line 33 "Taylor 200" is not in the reference list. - Paragraph 1 line 35 "Hazell et al 2002" is not in the reference list. - Paragraph 1 line 38 "Laswai et al, 200" is not in the reference list. - Paragraph 3 line 64, 291 "Powell et al, 1984" is not in the reference list. - Paragraph 3 line 64 , 291 " Thomson 1976" is not in the reference list. - Paragraph 3 line 73 check the spelling of "Camella". - Paragraph 4 line 83-84 check the spelling of "Chastain et al 1996 and 1995" - Paragraph 5 line 110-111 & 133-134 after ssp "siceraria" and "asiatica" should be italic. - Paragraph 5 line 106 & 116 check the date of "Schlumbaum and Vadorpe, 2011". - Paragraph 11 line 157 check the date of Desai "(2010)" - Paragraph 12 line 164 instead of "pear shaped" word "pyriform" can be used. - Name of the figures in the text should be used consistently same either "Figure x" or " Fig. x". There are both usage in the text should be corrected. "Sillitoe, 1983" in line 161, 248 is not in the reference list. "Loukou <i>et al.</i>, 2011" in line 174, 183 and 185 is	1-10, 13-17, 19-28, 39-44 Reference list was updated to include all references cited in the text - Taylor (2000) was replaced with Mayers <i>et al.</i> 2012. More relevant and recent. See Paragraph 1 line 33 - Hazell et al 2000 was replaced with Fader et al 2013. More relevant and recent See paragraph 1 line 35 - Spelling of Camella changed to Camelia. See paragraph 3 line 72 - Spelling of Chastain corrected. See paragraph 4 line 82 - siceraria and asiatica italicised in paragraph 5 line 110 and 111 The word pear shaped was replaced with pyriform in paragraph 1 line 164. 12. Consistency in text on figures was corrected.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not in the reference list 15. In line 176 check the date of “Haque <i>et al.</i>, 2006”. 16. Line 179, “Prasad and Prasad, 1979” is not in the reference list. 17. (FAO) (1992), in line 1999 is not in the reference list. 18. In line 291, part of the sentence “there is little information on seed its quality” should be corrected as “there is little information on its seed quality” 19. In line 304 check the “Burgrass and Powell <i>et al.</i> 1984”. 20. “Odindo (2008)” in line 307 is not in the reference list. 21. Mabhaudhi and Modi (2010)in line 324,325 is not in the reference list. 22. Check the spelling of Idikuta <i>et al.</i> in line (Idikut in list) 328. 23. “Kaydan and Yamur, 2008” in line 351 in not in the reference list. 24. “Larsen and Andreassen, 2004” in line 353 is not in the reference list. 25. “Sadraz (2006)” in line 358 is not in the reference list. 26. Checkk the date of “Vaughton and Ramsey (1998)” in line 362. 27. “Benuelos and Obeso, 2005” in line 366 is not in the reference list. 28. “Leishman, 2001” is not in the reference list. 29. “Venable,1992”in line 368 is not in the reference list. Merterial and methods 30. Number of seed in each replication should be added in lines 401-402.	1 8. Sentence corrected see paragraph 3 line 290 30. The following statement “ The number of seeds used per replicate varied for each
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	31. Seed of bottle gourd is a non-endospermic seed. So dimensions and size of the endosperm in bottle gourd is not be measured. Bottle gourd has cotyledonic seed and in this study, dimensions and size of embryo were measured. Word “endosperm” must be replaced with “embryo” throughout the manuscript. 32. In seed morphology measurement 100 seeds from each landraces were used. Was this number of seeds in each replication or whole seed from each landraces. 10 seed is too low for measurements and implementation in an open pollinated species such as bottle gourd. This is weak point of the study. 33. “(AOSA, 1992)” in line 431 is not in the reference list. 34. Check the sentence in 444-445 “Seed electrical conductivity was determined using here replications of initially weighed 20 seeds per treatment following imbibition in 100 ml of de-ionized water at 25°C for 24 hours”. Results 35. Check the Cite of figure names in the text, should be consistent. Significant differences ($P < 0.001$) were observed across the landrace selections for both seed and endosperm length (Figure 3). Landrace selection Cal had the longest seed length and this was followed by ZIM 2. The shortest landrace selections were R, C and S, respectively. A similar trend of length was observed in endosperm length (Fig.3). 36. Check the legend of Figure 6 “Fig. 6. Seed and endosperm length of selected bottle gourd landrace selections (ZIM1, ZIM2, R, S, C and Cal).	experiment. Details of each experiment are given below” was added to clarify seed numbers per replicate. See paragraph 3 line 402 31. The word endosperm was replaced with embryo throughout the manuscript line 473, 476, 478, 480, 482, 485, 492, 498, 500, 504, 507, 512, 516, 524, 528, 535, 541, 543, 548, 32. Refer to response No. 2 34. The word here was replaced with the word three. See paragraph 3 line 443 35. Citations of figures within the text was corrected. see line 476 36. For legend of Fig 6. Length was corrected to lengths. See line 535
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	37. Check the sentence and compare with Figure 9. "Results show that landrace selection C had the <u>least</u> amount of fibre in their seed coats and selection S had the <u>least</u> (Fig.9)". 38. Presenting correlations between measured characteristics with a table will be more useful (for easy understand) than present conditions. Add a table showing correlation co-efficient and significance level. 39. Sousa and Fihlo (2002) in line 765 is not in the reference list. 40. "Gracia <i>et al.</i> 20039" in line 787 is not in the reference list 41. Islam <i>et al.</i> (2009) in line 789 is not in the reference list. 42. Akita <i>et al.</i> (1986) , in line797 is not in the reference list. 43. Maree (2008)in line 800 check the date. It was 1998 in th list. 44. Williams JT, Haq N. 2013; Tan YC, Lai JS, Adhikari KR, Shakya SM, Shukla AK, Sharma KR 2009; Soltani A, Galeshi S, Zeinali E.200; Galloway LF.2001; Fonseka HH and Fonseka RM. 2009 and Charkabarti AK, Mukherjee SK, Maiti GG, Kabi MC. SEM, 2003 are in the list but they were not cited in the text?!	37. Sentence was corrected to read "had the <u>least</u> amount of fibre in their seed coats and selection S had the <u>most</u>" see line 572 38. The majority of the correlations were not significant. Usually the norm is that you do not present results that are statistically not significant. Therefore we only presented results which were statistically significant. References that were not cited in the text was removed
--	---	---