



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18483
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability and Association of Traits in (Mid-altitude) Sesame (Sesamum indicum L.) Germplasm of Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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	1. The format used to prepare the abstract is not commonly use. The traditional method of using descriptive paragraphs is recommended. 2. Common terms such as correlation and sesame are not suggested to be used in the keywords selection. 3. Instead of presenting all the definitions of the acronym names like in L89-92, construction of a table with all the acronym names and definitions is suggested. The acronym name should then be used throughout the rest of the text instead of spelling out in full as in Tables 1 and 2. 4. "traits" and "character" are used interchangeably. Using just one term is more preferable. 5. What happens to the diagonal matrix in Table 4? 6. The necessity of including dissimilarity and similarity of study results with previous studies in the results and discussions sections is highly debateable. 7. Naming of the genotypes is unclear in Figure 1.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. L48, a better scientific term than "cakes" should be used. 2. Need to clean up some spacing errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a well-written article. The study design is logical. Study results have been clearly presented with adequate evidence and supporting facts. The conclusions are concise and well supported by study results.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kwong Fai Andrew Lo
Department, University & Country	Chinese Culture University, Taiwan