



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>The text requires corrections.</p> <p><b>For authors:</b></p> <p><b>Abstract and text:</b></p> <p>Please use one name. I suggest *under* and change the *fruit* into *under*. The description must be precise. In one place is under biometry, in another fruit biometry. Please check and correct the description for other alternative names.</p> <p>Line 42: You have to write what have been achieved. This is what we know in the results.</p> <p>Line 72: Give accuracy; 0.01 g?</p> <p>Line: 80: Did you weigh the samples. On what is the type of weight and with what accuracy. What mass had the sample. These percentages are not clear.</p> <p>Line: 83: Why this procedure is described separately. After all, when determining the moisture content, you have the same date. Why do you enter the dry matter content in gram. It does not make sense. The dry mass is given in percent. It should be relative to the mass.</p> <p>Line 105: And what do they express?</p> <p>Line 111: I suggest you to a correlation analysis between the indicators.</p> <p>Line 116: Is this an objective or subjective evaluation? The method should be described.</p> <p>Line 142: Are all regression coefficients in the quadratic model statistically significant? I suggest that the functions for indicators should have specific designations, e.g. instead of everywhere y write a designation for length l; length seed - ls, under length - lp (correct the fruit for the pod), etc. for other physical quantities. For time (day) t. Constants in equations should have such accuracy, as is the accuracy of measurement, e.g. 2.8871 is too accurate, just 2.89. There is an error on the ordinate (C). Instead of (mm) it should be (cm). This is the method and it corresponds to reality. It's good in the text, see Line 125.</p> <p>Correct errors in length and thickness.</p> <p>Line 165: If the dry mass is in percent, then please prepare one with two graphs. In Fig. (B), the ordinate has commas. Please, change to dots. This is decomposition in the form of dots. Please change in the system settings to draw such coordinates.</p> <p>Line 178: How is the difference between these indicators? What the new. explaining the second. Only one indicator is cleared</p> <p>Line 194: On the ordinate axes, replace the commas with dots as the decimal separator.</p>	<p><b>Text corrections:</b></p> <p><b>Abstract and text:</b> Corrections were made. The terms "fruit" were replaced for "pod" in the abstract and in the text.</p> <p>Line 42: Corrected. We removed the indicators that were in the objective and present in the results.</p> <p>Line 72: Corrected. Accuracy of 0.01 mm</p> <p>Line: 80: Yes, the samples were weighed. The samples used were the same used for water content, after evaporation of the water content in the pods and seeds [Methodology Brazil (2009)], the seeds and pods presented only the dry matter, which was weighed in an analytical scale (0.001 g precision)</p> <p>Line: 83: Corrected. The dry matter was determined in conjunction with the water content. However, the water content was expressed as percentage (Metodology Brazil (2009) and after determination of the water content, the samples were weighed in an analytical scale to obtain the dry matter, presented in grams.</p> <p>Line 105: It was corrected to grams.</p> <p>Line 111: The indicators were submitted to polynomial regression due to the analysis in relation to time. This statistical analysis is commonly performed in other manuscripts that developed research related to physiological maturation.</p> <p>Line 116: Corrected, the methodology was described.</p> <p>Line 142: All are quadratic, except for number of seeds, that is linear. Specific designations were placed for indicators in all functions and their precisions were changed. Figure C presented an error, it was corrected. The length of the pod is presented in figure B. I kept it in millimeter in figure C, because thickness and width of the pods are indicators of small measurements. The error pointed out on line 125 was in the figure and not in the text.</p> <p>Line 165: As previously described the dry mass was performed together the water content and was weighed on analytical scale and expressed in grams. The methodology was confusing and, therefore, rewritten. Only the water content was in percentage. The dry matter could be represented in percentage as well, however in published manuscripts it is determined in grams, as realized in this work, what make it easier for discussion.</p> <p>Line 178: Germination is only the raw data of the percentage of germinated seeds. The germination speed index proposed by Maguire (1962) demonstrates the uniformity of the seed lot, which compared to the germination gives us the notion of the vigor of the seed lot. When the plot coincides, we see a high vigor of the seed lot used, since its germination was uniform.</p> <p>Line 194: When the manuscript is visualized by me it shows points in the numbers (.), but when the file is sent it goes back to coma (,) this is probably due to different versions of our Word program, to avoid that, we pasted the figures as image.</p>