



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4900
Title of the Manuscript:	Predicting the Longevity of Sesame Seeds under Short-Term Containerized Storage with Charcoal Desiccant

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
After reading the revised version, more serious questions turned up: Methods: How many replicates and how many seeds were used to determine moisture content? Results: Are there significant differences in moisture content for different treatments? By looking at Fig 1 it seems control (0g) and 200 g charcoal have the same moisture content. If this is the case, the better germination results for 200g treatment can't be linked to the desiccation of the seeds, and this should be mentioned in the discussion. Each treatment and time point has just one value, so there was no repetition? Section 3.4, second paragraph can be shortened by just mentioning how treatments and time sign. differed in moisture content (they probably did not). How come seeds had 12% moisture content at the begin of the experiment and then dropped to 3% even without desiccation agent? Were seeds fresh and had an after ripening phase? Why should 200g produce the best values for half life calculation and 160g the worst? I would guess it is coincidence and results would probably be different if desiccation treatments were replicated. Figure 1 is unacceptable. Please check other articles for a good figure. Get rid of background colour, extra lines, use same axis scale etc. All 5 graphs can be combined in one, which makes it easier for visual comparison. Table 4 can go into annex. In several tables both, germination % and number of germinated seeds is mentioned. Redundant, keep only %. I would not trust the results, since for me it is still a pseudoreplication, and not a proper experimental setup. The charcoal treatments have no replicates, the moisture content has no replicate. The topic and the already invested work are worth a bigger trail.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer