



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript Ms_JEAI_49783 titled "Effects of gamma rays on cocona (<i>Solanum sessiliflorum</i> Dunal)" has found that Gamma radiation doses 100 Gy and 150 Gy were statistically different from others used in the study notably 200 Gy, 300 Gy, and 400 Gy. In fact, authors recommended irradiation of cocona seeds with 150 Gy which induced variation in fruit pilosity, increased the number of fruits per plant, and fruit yield while preserving over fruit components. At 300 Gy and 400 Gy seeds did not germinated at all and authors considered the two radiation doses deleterious. 2. Despite the noticeable results obtained from this work, the manuscript cannot yet be recommended for publication by the Journal of Experimental Agriculture International for the following reasons and not limited to: 3. The scientific writing and the English language needed improvement. 4. A short communication has a different structure than a regular article. It is the case of the abstract which was unnecessary similar to that of a regular article. 5. The reporting structure was not scientific (logical) enough. Results of the comparison of means were not to be presented before those of the ANOVA, a pre-requisite to the DUNCAN test. By so doing, there would have been no point comparing mean values of fruit yield (though there should be radiation effect for this character not found by the authors), mean fruit mass, fruit length, fruit diameter, L/D ratio and ripeness. 6. The section "Conclusion" was not needed but it was preferable to make a concluding statement. 7. The high number of references indicated that the work was not as so novel as expected from a short communication. 8. Authors are advised to consider revising the manuscript based on the above-listed remarks and on the comments of the Editorial Board made on the revised manuscript, attached herewith this editorial decision. 	<p>We made most modifications according the editor suggestions. But we consider unnecessary show the ANOVA table because it repeats the same results showed in the means table. To help the understanding, it was increased the estimated F values and P-values for treatments.</p> <p>In addition, the means table showed the coefficient of variation, which suggests the experimental accuracy level. CV over 30% indicates low accuracy. In fruit yield was observed CV=59%, in consequence F test cannot detect differences between means. Hence, this character should be assessed with more plants per plot.</p>