



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_43317
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenological and flowering features of four exotic apple cultivars on M9T337 rootstock under high density plantation in North Himalayan region of India
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>)

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	In the section of results and discussion it is observed that the author or authors repeat the information that is already in the tables, which makes it boring to read the manuscript, because the reader who detects this form of interpretation will stop reading it and go to the tables that they contain the same thing that is said in the text. For this reason I believe that the manuscript must be rewritten, because the information it contains is important for producers, technicians, scientists, students and professors in the field of agronomy, specifically in the fruit growing part.	Most of the results are in the numerical form which need to be interpreted the way I have written the results and discussion.
Minor REVISION comments	The authors must make clear what the reference date is with respect to the expression of the characteristics; likewise, who has established the average number of days for the emergency of a organ specific. For example, I would say: The variety with more precocity in days to bud break, days to silver tip stage, days to green tip stage and days to leafing out, was Gala Red Lum with 10, 5, 2 and 1 less in comparison to the average of reference (25 days) in the region. While Golden Clone B was the more late with days for the appearance of the same phenological stages. I'm assuming an average of 25 days, although I know it's not the right thing to do, but the authors must know the average number of days that it is indicated in the region for the start of each phenological stage of the materials studied. Still, I consider that rewriting the manuscript in the indicated parts, including the conclusions, are minor issues. since the data generated are important for plans or programming in the production of apples.	The reference date used for all of the different phenological varieties id first of march so that each stage may be expressed in number of days. Moreover the study is conducted among the four varieties and not compared with any of the other varieties in region. The actual dates of their phenological stages will help ascertain their possibility of growing with other compatible varieties.
Optional/General comments	The authors should review and adapt the abstract, results and conclusions; also, some abbreviations in the tables, since is mentioned the phrase "days after the reference date" (DARD), but this does not agree with the materials that were more precocious.	Same will be put under materials