



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_8999
Title of the Manuscript:	Sugars in Whole Sesame Seed : Effects of Cultivars, Planting Dates, and Row Spacings
Type of the Article	

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments L 21-38 L 42-43 L 45-54 L48 L 57-64 L 66-69 L70	Introduction lacks detail and why is there a need to characterize the sugar composition of sesame seed? Explain Combine subheadings into one. Do not need a one sentence subheading Lack of detail in this section. What type of planter? Seeding rate? Raised beds? Plot length? Weather conditions in each year during growing season? How was sesame harvested? etc List planting dates in order. July 9 before July 17 Again, a lack of detail Years also had an effect on fructose, total sugars, and raffinose How can you say an early May planting? May 23 is not early	We focused on sugars because of negative issues related to sugar consumption and its' effects on diabetes and obesity. It is known that about 34% of sesame is consumed as food whereas the rest is used as an oilseed. The INTRODUCTION has been modified to indicate why we focused on sugars. Required details have been added to the manuscript. Years were treated as random factors in our analysis i.e. a factor that can't be controlled. Early vs. Late terms are used as relative terms. Corrections have been made.
Minor REVISION comments L 6 L 8 and elsewhere in manuscript L 25 L 30 L 30 L 33	Remove () from g/100g meal Change percent to % 850 million what? Dollars? Latin name for tobacco Peanuts are still grown in VA, so the crop is not lost. Do you mean a reduction in acreage? explain Latin name of sesame already stated above (L 22)	DONE



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I rejected this manuscript (and quit reviewing after the section on planting dates, L 76) because of 2 factors. 1) too little detail in the Introduction and Material and Methods section and 2) this research is not replicated over time. The manuscript basically is one yr of research on late May to early June planting dates and one yr of research on July planting dates. You cannot draw any conclusions on planting dates so far apart in separate years. Temperature, rainfall, and other factors are so different during those time periods that I would not want to attempt to accurately predict results. I suggest that the authors do at least another yr of research to approximate May 23, June 8, July 9 and July 17 planting dates. Dates do not have to be exact but as close as possible to the above mentioned dates.	Additional details have been added to the manuscript. This study was replicated over time i.e. this study was conducted over two years. We treated YEARS as a random factor in our analysis i.e. a factor that can't be controlled. Finals analysis is based on data combined from two years.
---	--	--