



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36650
Title of the Manuscript:	Salicylic acid on maintenance of peaches 'Chimarrita' and 'Maciel' under cold storage
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	There are many grammar mistakes and should be corrected. Use "weight loss" instead of the "mass loss". What is "pulp firmness"? How did you measure the firmness? Did you measure with or without the peel of the fruit? If you measured the firmness without peel you have to use "flesh firmness". If you measured it with the peel you should use "fruit firmness". This term should be changed according to the information mentioned above. The colour measurement is one of the most useful analyses to determine the quality, especially for the postharvest quality, of the horticultural crops. I suggest to pay attention to this issue in your future work. The sensorial evaluation (visual quality, texture, and taste-aroma) is a very important way to determine the storage life and shelf life of the horticultural crops. The lack of this assessment constitutes the weak side of the article. The first paragraph of the "Results and Discussion" section should be removed and added to the "Material and Method" section. And also the first paragraph of the "3.2 Maciel Cultivar" should be removed and added to the "Material and Method" section.	The authors agree to the suggested corrections.
Minor REVISION comments	The reader should be able to understand what it is saying by looking at the figure without looking at the manuscript. The figures are very confused and hard to understand. They can be simplified.	
Optional/General comments		