



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_37066
Title of the Manuscript:	Dormancy studies in apple trees cultivars grown under mild climate
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Very long Introduction 2. Lines 14 to 23 could be the good sentence for discussion 3. Lines 64 to 88. Where did-you inspire? From literature? Please indicate an author. 4. Very interesting results, but the discussion is poor. 5. Please the discussion must be documented	1. Suggestion accepted: two paragraphs were deleted, and some phrases were combined/joined (similar meaning); 2. Suggestion accepted: another paragraph in Discussion session were added regarding the theme of El Niño consequences; 3. Suggestion accepted: authors were added [7], and some nomenclatures were changed in order to standardize; 4. and 5. Suggestion accepted: Discussion was improved, with more recent references (2016 and 2017);
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Lines 58 to 62 could be located in the map 2. No working in this topic on 2016 and 2017? No reference from 2016 and 2017?	1. Suggestion partially accepted: instead of the map, new information regarding the geographical position and climate conditions were added; 2. Suggestion accepted: Discussion was improved, with more recent references (2016 and 2017);
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		The authors would like to thank all the important contributions from the reviewer, which helped to improve que quality of this article, especially in the Discussion.