



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6480
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE GROWTH RESPONSES OF SESAME (<i>SESAMUM INDICUM</i> L.) AND FALSE SESAME (<i>CERATOTHECA SESAMOIDES</i> ENDL.) TO COLCHICINE TREATMENTS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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 aim of the study must be written in past tense. Lines 43-49 are unnecessary. They should be omitted. Calcium, Phosphorus and Iron should be written all in lowercase. Conjunctivitis should not be in italics. Much of the data included in the article is also included in the article "Mutagenic Effects of Colchicine on Some Quantitative Traits of False Sesame (Ceratotheca sesamoides Endl.) written by Nura, S., A.K. Adamu, S. Mu'Azu and D.B. Dangora. I. It is no necessary to continue the revision of the document. The data has been published earlier.	We agreed with the reviewer. All suggested corrections done. Data modified to differentiate the two works. Data on germination percents 7 DAS was changed with that of 14 DAS. Data on seedlings height and flowering period were removed. Data on 1000 seeds weight and dry weight are added
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 29. Close the parenthesis. Keywords. Line 37. Verify font number, lines 21-22. There are some language errors. The manuscript is generally understandable, but English redaction should be improved.	All corrections been made as suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		