

Editorial comment:

I would like to have seen if there was really any mutagenesis, since all treated seeds responded extremely well compared to control. Another thing to mention is the control treatment. Were these seeds soaked in a solution without colchicine for four hours? Could the immersion in this solution have soaked seeds coating, making them soft, thus making easier for the seeds to germinate? This is a way of breaking seed dormancy which is attributed to hard coatings. Furthermore, I do not quite understand the experimental design. The authors speak of a block design, but I was not able to see the source of variation which has driven them to use blocks. It seems to me that the experiment fits better to completely randomized design or must be properly described.

I would also like to see more assumptions in the discussion (although I admit this is difficult) on the possible ways colchicine acted, as all treated plants were superior than control (which is quite peculiar to me, since it seems that all mutations are superior).

These remarks of mine are of minor significance but they could improve the quality of the manuscript, so I would urge the authors to consider them and try to respond.

Author's feedback:

COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUEST

The aim of the study was to determine the colchicines concentration to which the two plants responded the most. In so doing, 0.1mM concentration was found to have the highest response. The reviewer seems not to fully know the nature of sesame and false sesame seeds. These seeds do not have very hard seed coats and even the controls were pre-soaked in distilled water for four hours as the treatments. Factorial arrangements using Randomized complete block design was used. Refer back to our tables and you can see that, our first source of variation is the block.