



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4900
Title of the Manuscript:	Predicting the Longevity of Sesame Seeds under Short-Term Containerized Storage with Charcoal Desiccant
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	Material and methods are not appropriately described. Statistical analysis was neither well explained nor appropriately presented. Table 1 is meaningless. Table 3 is not in line with the material & methods section (no information about the storage periods was given). Table 4 is too large and its description was not well done (e.g. lines 306/307 are not in line with the obtained results). Finally, the conclusion seems to be not acceptable: for each gram of seeds it is recommended at least 5 g of charcoal (is this possible /appropriate?).	1. The Material and Methods section captures what was done and how it was done, including the technicalities involved. Minor editing has been done, and I think it is presentable enough. 2. Statistical analyses has been represented, and in the most possible simple way. 3. Table 1 is not meaningless; for it is the table (ANOVA) that shows if the factors are significant or not, and for which variable(s). It is necessary. 4. Table 3 is in line with the material and methods. It is the table of means for the storage periods. The storage periods are given in the first column of the table and the means by variables in the other columns. It gives in formation on differences among the storage periods. The message here is clear enough. 5. Really, table 4 is long; but the information is clear and not confusing. Breaking the table will isolate the information, and that may be meaningless. 6. The conclusion is straight forward and specific enough. I think the message is clear, and the recommendation the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		reviewer pointed out is not really part of my conclusion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No comments.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No comments.	