



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 (<i>Corchorusolitorius</i> 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 comments (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 submitted manuscript deserves consideration for publication in American Journal of Experimental Agriculture after major and minor revisions, since it provides an important contribution in research field. Finally, the following points should be considered: Title- Scientific name of jute mallow should be deleted from the title. Abstract: This section needs to reorganize. It should be brief and have only important finding with solid data. However, authors have mentioned several information on experimental approaches. In addition, proposed application should be removed to conclusion section. Introduction: The introduction section, the author should provide adequate and upgrade background in this section from recent years. Experimental 1. How many specimens of samples for each testing? Authors should be given. 2. The results and discussion section should be refined according to the real fact and finding and reduce excess previous researcher statement.	Scientific name deleted from the title. Abstract has been made more quantitative. See conclusion at the end of discussion. 1. We already stated that we used four replicates for each treatment at every test. 2. We made these sections quantitative



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion: there are no conclusions in this manuscript? It is very important to conclude the research. The author should add the conclusion part.	Conclusion has been provided
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	•Line 6: Steeping of jute mallow (Corchorusolitorius) please re-write the spelling like this (Corchorusolitorius L.) •Line 12: this is not clear "6-18WAS". The author should explain in manuscript it stand for what means. Line 104: the author should explain in detail why the interaction between steeping treatment and cultivar on seed germination was significant from 8WAS (Table 3).	Corrected Explained See end of first paragraph on page 9
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• moderate and can consider for publication after revision • the author please keep in mind, never miss the conclusion part in the future!!.	Noted