

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Mon, Nov 18, 2013 at 4:17 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013_AJEA_6480

I read the response of the author and although I was fully covered on the seed soaking treatment of control, I still have doubts whether there is need for a block design or not. From what the author wrote he has used three blocks but do not state the nature of these blocks. Why was there a need to construct blocks? Which was the variable due to which the blocks were formed?. The block design is used when you already know a source of variation (in a field for example, when a large area of it has high CaCO₃ content while the others not, you must perform all treatments in this area too, in order to reduce variability due to the effect of different soil conditions). In the present experiment the authors do not state which was the source of variation the blocks incorporated. If there is not such a source then the results of the statistical analysis could be different. It is not enough just to say "see the table where the blocks appear" since the question here is not whether they proceeded to RCBD or not but why they proceeded to such a design and which was the source of variation the block describe.

I did not see any assumption on the possible action of colchicine, but it is understandable. I am still impressed though by the fact that all mutations were superior than control, something which to me (not an expert) seems quite peculiar.

Based on the remarks of the reviewers, since they are the experts, I suggest publication of this manuscript after the authors state the source of variation for the block design.

Editor's Details:

Peter A. Roussos

Lab. Pomology, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.