SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_12517**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The quality of jute mallow (*Corchorusolitorius* L.) seeds exposed to different hot water-steeping and cooling protocols**
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** *(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	**The manuscript aimed to study the effect of different hot water-steeping and cooling protocols on the germination of two cultivars of jute mallow.** **There are several major concerns and criticisms that DO NOT grant the paper to recommend its publication.** **An important concern arisen after revision is the writing style, which is difficult to read and understand. It is suggested to perform English edition into all body text.** **The abstract is not representative of the whole study. In general is descriptive. It should show quantitative data and not abuse of concepts such as enhanced, better, greater, slower, less, etc.** **Although the experiments seem well conducted, the results, discussion and conclusions are descriptive, poorly convincing and rather speculative.** **The results section should be linked with tables and figures correctly. Some paragraphs are difficult to follow due to the lack of connection with data.** **The paper is not well focused in the germination phenomena as a physiological and biochemical**	Well, all the key observations have been noted and were necessary corrections effected to the best of our ability. Conclusion is now included in the revised manuscript.

	process. The study only focuses on germination as a percentage of germinated seeds and therefore difficult to correlate with relevant parameters such as vigour and viability of seeds and seedling development. **Especially the discussion is very speculative, for instance it is not clear how germination correlates with parameters such as permeability, vigour, variability of dormancy, weakness of seed coat and seed longevity. There are not data that consistently demonstrate these correlations.** **The authors should consider the assessment of variables such as vigour and seed viability to provide convincing arguments related with germination process, otherwise they cannot explain in deep the data presented in the manuscript.** **The manuscript does not have <u>CONCLUSIONS.</u>**	

Minor REVISION comments	**The title should consider mentioning germination instead of quality of seeds.** **Scientific name of jute mallow is "*Corchorus olitorius* L." and not "*Corchorusolitorius* L."** **It is suggested to use grammar corrector to correct separation among words.** **In materials and methods section, there are not details of procedures and formulas. The authors just use references (eg. Oladiran, 1996; ISTA, 2005; Labouriau, 1983; Ranal and Santana, 2006; Primack, 1980). It is suggested that authors consider a detailed explanation of these procedures to ensure reproducibility of experiments.** **Table 1 does not have units and statistics parameters (eg, significance, SD).** **All tables lack of units.** **All tables describe statistical parameters comparing between cultivars and steeping treatments (columns), however there are not comparison among storage periods (row) between cultivars and steeping treatments.** **The figures lack units (germination rate and synchronization). In addition there are no statistical significance for treatments and it is not clear what the SD bars represent.**	
Optional/General comments		